

BX
9946
.Y3







DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

F. YATES,

METHODIST,

AND

E. FRANCIS,

UNIVERSALIST.

DOVER, N. H.

FROM F. GRANT'S PRESS, EXETER.



A

DISCUSSION

OF THE

CONJOINT QUESTION,

IS THE DOCTRINE OF ENDLESS PUNISHMENT FOR ANY PART
OR PORTION OF THE HUMAN FAMILY TAUGHT IN THE SCRIP-
TURES; OR, IS THE DOCTRINE OF THE FINAL HOLINESS AND
HAPPINESS OF ALL MANKIND?

BETWEEN

FREEMAN YATES,

PASTOR OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, SOUTH-BERWICK, ME.

AND

EBEN FRANCIS,

PASTOR OF THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, DOVER, N. H.

CONSISTING OF

EIGHT DISCOURSES,

DELIVERED IN DOVER, N. H.

IN THE MONTHS OF MARCH AND APRIL, 1843.

EXETER: N. H.

PRINTED BY FRANCIS GRANT.

1843.



EX9946
.Y3

TO THE READER.

The following discourses were prepared in haste, amid the multiplicity of our other duties.

As the congregation, which was present on the last evening of the discussion, so unanimously requested their publication, we cheerfully accede thereto.

This, we believe, will be sufficient apology for our present appearance before the public.

DISCUSSION,

PART I. No. I.

IN THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, WEDNESDAY EVENING, MARCH 15, 1843.

BY F. YATES.

QUESTION *Is the doctrine of endless punishment for any part or portion of the human family taught in the Scriptures; or, is the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?*

QUESTIONS of more importance than these were never presented to the mind of man. Our race, of whatever clime, has ever looked towards the future with deep interest, and most men, whether sage or savage, have looked forward with expectations of future existence.

The Bible comes to us from the hand of the Father of the Universe, dispelling the doubts, and confirming the faith of those who receive it, by pointing them to a state of being beyond the confines of the present world. To this holy Book we must turn, not only to learn the *fact* of our future existence, but also the *character* of that existence. The great body of those who regard the Bible as a revelation from God have believed that it teaches that man is a moral agent, governed by a moral law, the proper penalty of which is *endless punishment*. But some few, in these latter days, have risen up, and called in question the doctrine of endless punishment. They tell us that the world has been deceived altogether in reference to this subject. The Bible does not teach — what the most pious and

learned men of all ages of the Christian Church have believed — that “a part or portion of the human family” will be endlessly miserable, but directly the contrary, that “all mankind will be finally holy and happy.” If this be the truth it is important that it should be known; if biblical students for 1800 years have failed to discover this doctrine, which, it is contended, was the doctrine taught by Christ and his apostles, — if this discovery was reserved for the wisdom of the present age, we may bless ourselves that we live in such auspicious times, that the lines have fallen to us in such pleasant places; for the discovery of truth should always be a matter of thanksgiving. But before we congratulate ourselves too highly, let us pause a few moments and examine the claims of such new teachers to our confidence in their doctrine. We are commanded in scripture to “*try* the spirits, and see if they be of God,” for we are told that “*false teachers* shall arise.” If any man bring to us any other gospel than that preached by Christ and his apostles, we are bound to reject it. Let us examine, therefore, and see what was taught by him who “spake as never man spake,” and those who were instructed at his feet. Was there any such thing known in the time of Christ and his apostles as the doctrine of endless punishment? and what was the conduct of these teachers in reference to this subject? Were they found opposing it, or did they take such a course as would lead the believers in endless punishment to conclude that this was their doctrine also? These inquiries I shall endeavour to answer on this occasion.

I. *Was the doctrine of endless punishment believed by both Jews and Gentiles in the days of Christ and his apostles?* In answer to this question it is sufficient to say, that Universalists themselves *admit* that the doctrine of endless punishment was extensively believed by Jews and Gentiles at the time of Christ’s ministry. The following are some of their testimonies on this point. “The Pharisees it is well known believed in the endless punishment of human souls.” *Lectures by W. M. Fernald*, p. 79. “It is generally admitted that the Jews, in our Savior’s day, maintained the Pagan notion of immortal happiness for the righteous, and undying pain for the sinner.” *Letter in the*

Trumpet Feb. 3, 1838. "That the Pharisees believed in a punishment after death we do not deny." *Whittemore's Notes on the Parables*, p. 62. "Jews and heathen believed in endless punishment. *Balfour's Essays*, p. 326.

We might enlarge these quotations from Universalist authors, to show that the doctrine was generally received by both Jews and Gentiles. The following is given to show how extensively it prevailed among them at the time our Savior, the great teacher of truth and righteousness, was in their midst publishing his own gospel. Mr. Balfour, in his *inquiry*, p. 260, where he attempts to show that the Jews obtained their notions of endless punishment from the heathen, says — "The introduction of this and other heathen opinions among the Jews was gradual, but in the days of our Lord, had become general, with perhaps the exception of the sect of the Sadducees." This sect composed but a small part of the Jewish nation. Having established this point by the testimony of Universalists, we will inquire,

II. *Was Christ or his apostles, who lived and preached in the midst of believers in endless punishment, ever known to oppose this doctrine: or, were they ever opposed by others for believing and preaching the contrary doctrine?*

The doctrine of endless punishment is either true or false. If it is false, it is the invention of wicked men got up for unhallowed purposes. It was designed by its originators to frighten the superstitious into obedience by exciting their fears, and threatening them with endless torments if they should dare to go contrary to their wishes. We are told by the opposers of this doctrine that it originated among the heathen, and the Jews received it from them; and that in the time of our Lord and his apostles it had become general. This doctrine is regarded also by its opposers as the most destructive error that ever prevailed among men; nay, worse than all others put together. We will hear how Universalists of the present day speak in reference to this doctrine. What heart-rending feelings they must have on account of this "dreadful error." In the so called Gospel Banner of Feb. 20, 1841, the editor, speaking of the doctrine in question, says — "We believe it to be the greatest error of our times, — one fraught with the worst results to so-

ciety." The Lord save us from an error that reflects so ingloriously upon the ever adorable perfections of Almighty God, our heavenly Father. We would not see his character traduced and slandered by such a reflection upon his nature and proceedings. Neither would we see our fellow men oppressed and made wretched by such a faith." "We believe its influence is decidedly bad — injurious to good morals, and destructive to human happiness. Put all the errors of the world into one, and this would not equal in magnitude the one to which we refer. Is it any longer a wonder in your mind, reader, that we, as Universalists, should employ so much of our time in preaching and writing against this grand error. Nay, we *must* do it." Mr. Whittemore, in his *Modern History of Universalism*, says, "It is an error pregnant with evil consequences above every other." Again, *Guide*, p. 245 — "When we see the deep misery and heartfelt anguish which a sincere belief in the doctrine occasions, the heart bleeds for the unhappy sufferer."*

These extracts are in perfect keeping with Universalist presses and pulpits everywhere. On the supposition that Christ and his apostles had as much feeling for human woe as Universalists of the present time, and were as capable of judging of the effects of this doctrine which prevailed to such an alarming extent in their day, what would be expected of them? of him especially, whose heart was made of tenderness, and who needed not that any should teach him? Would it not be expected of Christ, who manifested such disinterested benevolence for the children of men, and whose great object was to secure human happiness, that he would have opposed such an error as this in a manner which would have set the matter at rest with his followers at least? But did he, or his apostles ever come in collision with either Jew or Gentile on this subject? Where is it recorded? Four of his disciples, who were his constant followers, have given all of his history that infinite wisdom saw fit for the benefit of future generations, but they have not mentioned a single instance of the kind. He was often found exposing other errors, trifling indeed when compared

*These extracts are taken from an Essay written by Rev. N. D. George, of the Maine (Methodist) Conference, to which Essay I am indebted for some of the thoughts contained in this discourse.

with the one of which we speak, if it be an error, but no where do we read of his coming in contact with any one on this point; or warning his disciples against it, though he often warned them against other errors of the day. The Pharisees frequently met him with various objections, but we never read of their opposing him for believing and preaching that all men would be saved.

We have a brief history of the acts of the apostles, giving frequent accounts of disputations with both Jews and Gentiles, who were believers in endless misery, but no account of opposition on either hand in respect to this doctrine. We have twenty-two Epistles, written by the apostles and addressed to believers in endless punishment, and while they name and expose numerous errors the correctness of this doctrine is never called in question.

“Is it not strange, passing strange, that the greatest teacher the world ever saw, or ever will see, whose heart was made of tenderness, should dwell in the midst of a people believing in an error which outweighs all others put together, and never once raised a warning voice against it, nor showed them its man-degrading, God-dishonoring character? His apostles too, who received their theology from his own blessed lips, labored and reared Churches in the midst of believers in the hated doctrine, yet nowhere in their history do we learn that they raised a single note of alarm against it.”

In view of the fact that the doctrine of endless punishment so extensively prevailed in the days of Christ and his apostles, would not their *silence* on this subject be enough to show that they held the same doctrine, and therefore, that it is the doctrine of the Bible? But,

III. *I come now to a third inquiry. — Did Christ and his Apostles use such language in their discourses and writings as was used by believers in endless punishment in reference to this subject?*

It will not be necessary for me to show that Christ or his apostles ever entered into any labored defence of the doctrine of endless punishment to prove that it was their doctrine. As this doctrine was almost universally believed, it was not necessa-

ry that they should take such a course. They did not spend their time in laboring to prove what every body admitted to be true. If I can show that they took the same course, and used the same language, in reference to this subject, as those who are admitted to be believers in endless punishment, my point will be gained.

First, I will inquire, what was the character of the Savior's teaching? Was his manner of preaching calculated to confound the believers in endless punishment, or to confirm them in their belief? I will suppose a case. A clergyman comes into this village and seeks an introduction to my opponent as a brother in the ministry. On the following sabbath he is invited to officiate. He reads for his morning lesson the seventh chapter of Matthew, the concluding portion of our Lord's Sermon on the Mount. Such passages as the following are read without comment: "Enter ye in at the straight gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because straight is the gate, and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many shall say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me ye that work iniquity." "And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell; and great was the fall of it."

The stranger reads for his text, "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish," (*Luke* xiii, 3.) He proceeds without any labored criticisms to *explain away*, and gives a plain and scriptural view of repentance. To show its necessity, he declares that all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." To show that men are pursuing a wrong course and ought to turn about, he exclaims with Ezekiel, turn ye, turn ye, from

your evil ways, for why will ye die? and with Isaiah, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God for he will abundantly pardon. For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord." He repeats his text, "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." To enforce this doctrine, he speaks of the destruction of the old world by water, of the cities of the plain by fire, as did Christ, — of the burial of the hardened Egyptians in the Red Sea, and of the calamities of the Jews in consequence of their impenitence. He speaks of individuals, — of Lot's wife, of Belshazer, and of Herod who was smitten with worms. Again he repeats his text with still greater emphasis, "*Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise PERISH.*" The speaker closes with the language of Paul, God "now commandeth all men everywhere to *repent*, because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained." (*Acts xvii. 30, 31.*) Would you begin to conclude that the speaker had provided universal salvation? or would you not at once declare that you had been imposed upon by a bigoted partialist? And yet this is the manner in which Christ and his apostles preached.

I shall now introduce a few passages of scripture, which I regard as teaching the doctrine in question, and which the Jews and those addressed *must have so understood*.

Luke xvi. 22 — 26. "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried: and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom: and he cried and said, Father Abraham have mercy upon me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence."

The object of this quotation is to show that Christ used such language as was used by the Jews in reference to future and eternal punishment. This will be seen at once by a quotation from *Josephus*, who lived and wrote in that age of the world. Let it be remembered that *Josephus* was a *Jewish historian*. The extracts are made from his discourse to the Greeks concerning *Hades*, which is the word that is rendered *hell* in the above passage. "Now as to *Hades*, wherein the souls of the righteous and the unrighteous are detained, it is necessary to speak of it. In this region there is a certain place set apart, as a lake of unquenchable fire, whereinto we suppose no one hath hitherto been cast, but it is prepared for a day afore determined of God, in which one righteous sentence shall be deservedly passed upon all men; when the unjust, and those that have been disobedient to God, and have given honor to such idols as have been the vain operations of the hands of men, as to God himself, shall be adjudged to this everlasting punishment, as having been the cause of defilement; while the just shall obtain an incorruptible and never fading kingdom. These are now indeed confined in *hades*, but not in the same place wherein the unjust are confined." Speaking of the place of the just, he says, "This place we call the bosom of *Abraham*."

With these extracts, exhibiting the belief of the Jews, it is easy to see how they must have understood the language of Christ in the above passage. When he spoke of *Lazarus* being carried to *Abraham's bosom*, the mind would at once be carried to the world of departed souls, and to that part of it prepared for the just. "This place we call the bosom of *Abraham*." When he spoke of the rich man, lifting up his eyes in *hades*, they at once called to mind that part of the invisible world in which the souls of the unjust are "retained until the day afore determined of God, in which one righteous sentence shall be deservedly passed upon all men." If there is no such thing as future punishment, and consequently no such place as that mentioned by *Josephus*, how can this conduct of the Savior be accounted for? Does he not *appear* to adopt the notion of the Jews? and how will he escape the charge of *deception*? Let my opponent attend to this matter.

Luke xii. 4, 5. "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, but after that have no more that they can do; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him." Mark ix. 43, 44. "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." This last expression, (where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched) occurs three times in this connection. The question again comes up — How did the Jews understand this language of the Savior? They could not have understood him as speaking of the *grave*, for two reasons. 1. Whatever is meant by hell here, it is a place into which man has no power to throw his victim, which is not true concerning the grave. 2. There is connected with this hell a worm that *dieth not*, and a *fire that shall never be quenched*, which is not true of the grave. How then would they be likely to understand this language? Suppose it to be language familiar to them, such as they were in the habit of using when speaking of endless punishment, would they not be very likely to understand it as speaking of the same doctrine? I will here introduce one more extract from Josephus, to show that this was the very language employed by the Jews when speaking of endless punishment, and consequently they must have understood Christ as teaching this doctrine. Speaking of the judgment, (which he held to be after the resurrection,) and of the judge, he says, "at whose judgment-seat, when all men and angels, and demons shall stand, — they will send forth one voice, and say, **JUST IS THY JUDGMENT**; the rejoinder to which will bring a just sentence upon both parties, by giving justly to those who have done well, an everlasting fruition; but allotting to the lovers of wicked works eternal punishment. *To these belong the unquenchable fire, and that without end, and a certain fiery worm, never dying*, and not destroying the body, but continuing its eruptions out of the body with never ceasing grief." Here we see that Christ employs their own phraseology, that with which they

were familiar ; and with what propriety or consistency, I ask, if he did not allow the doctrine ? Let my opponent answer this question — if he can.

I will now call attention to Matthew xxv. 31—46. “ When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered all nations ; and he shall separate them one from the other, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats : and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father ; inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world ; for I was an hungered and ye gave me meat,” &c. “ Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels ; for I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat,” &c. “ And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”

Now call to mind the fact that the Jews believed in a general judgment following the resurrection, and in the existence of a devil and evil angels, and in a hell burning with unquenchable fire, and that at the judgment, the wicked would go into everlasting punishment ; would they not be likely to understand Christ as teaching the same doctrine ? How otherwise could they have understood his language in this discourse ? Must not every *candid* man be constrained to admit that the Lord Jesus Christ not only countenanced these opinions of the Jews, but taught them clearly, and distinctly, as his own doctrine ? If then, he did not allow the doctrine of endless punishment, how can his conduct on this occasion be vindicated so as to clear him from the charge of gross hypocrisy and dishonesty ? It will avail nothing to attempt to show by criticism that the terms used here do not *necessarily* mean what they have generally been understood to mean. For instance, that the word *everlasting* in v. 46, does not strictly mean *endless*, for this is the term employed by the Jews to signify endless duration, and they must have so understood it in the above passage.

As this is an important passage in this discussion, I will offer a few remarks to show that it cannot be consistently interpreted so as to teach any thing short of future and endless punishment. I suppose the only question that will come up in this discussion in relation to this passage, is this, Does it relate in its fulfilment to this world, or must it have its accomplishment in the future state? If I can show that it cannot be fulfilled in this state of existence, it will then be applied, with common consent, to the resurrection state. And if the punishment threatened is to be inflicted in the future world, the controversy will be at an end.

We have already seen that the Jews must have understood the Savior as speaking of a general judgment at the end of this world, when he will receive his saints into his everlasting kingdom, and sentence the wicked to endless punishment. The following considerations I think sufficient to show that we must so understand it now.

1. The rewards and punishments here spoken of are to be distributed "*when the Son of Man shall come in his glory.*" This can mean nothing short of his personal appearance to our world, as will appear from a few passages of scripture which speak of his coming in such a manner as has never yet been witnessed. Matt. xxvi. 64. "Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven."—Acts i. 9, 10, 11. "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven, as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen him go into heaven."—1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord."—Rev. i. 7. "Behold, he

cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also, which pierced him; and all the kindred of the earth shall wail because of him."

These quotations are sufficient to establish the following points:

(1) The Son of man is to come again, — "*this same Jesus — the Lord himself.*"

(2) He is to come "*in like manner*" as he went up in the clouds of heaven "*with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God.*"

(3) His coming will be visible, — "*ye shall see him, every eye shall see him.*"

(4) "*The dead in Christ*" will then have a resurrection.

I think it is now *proved* that the coming of "the Son of Man in his glory" cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, but to his coming to judge the world in their resurrection state. In farther support of this view, I remark,

2. That his coming is to be accompanied by "*all the holy angels.*" When has Christ ever yet appeared with all the holy angels? 3. "*He shall sit upon the throne of his glory*" at his coming here spoken of. How did Christ sit upon the throne of his glory at the destruction of Jerusalem, any more than he did at the fall of Babylon?

4. "*All nations shall be gathered*" before Christ at his coming here referred to. Has this ever taken place?

5. Christ shall "*separate*" the gathered nations at that time. This has never taken place, nor will it till the general judgment.

6. The righteous are to be *rewarded* at this coming of Christ, such as cannot take place in this world; for the reward is in consideration of actions that are passed, and they are put in possession of a "kingdom" which they did not before possess; which cannot, therefore, be the gospel dispensation.

7. At the coming of Christ described in the text, the wicked will be sentenced to "everlasting punishment."

As these considerations show conclusively that this passage must be applied to the resurrection state, it is therefore *proved* that "a part or portion of the human family" will endure "*endless punishment.*"

Having examined the character of Christ's preaching in reference to future and eternal punishment, we will now inquire into the manner in which the apostles preached and wrote in respect to this subject. It has already been remarked that not an instance can be found where they directly opposed the doctrine of endless punishment, though they travelled extensively among Jews and Gentiles, and held frequent controversies with them on various subjects. In all the twenty-two Epistles written by them under the inspiration of the Almighty, no instance of opposition to this doctrine can be found. How does this look when compared with the labors and productions of the opposers of this doctrine at the present day? What would be thought of a Universalist Minister of the present day, who should publish a single sermon and not distinctly oppose the doctrine of endless punishment? Would his people be satisfied with it.

But I am prepared to show that the apostles, like their divine teacher, employed language directly calculated to confirm the believers in endless misery, and which has led the brightest intellects that have ever adorned Christendom to believe that they taught this doctrine.

Take for example the language of Paul, 2 Thess. 1. 7—9. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Is not this strange talk for a Universalist minister? especially when writing to believers in endless misery! Would those who claim to be his brethren of the present day be guilty of such a thing? Let the candid think of this.

I know of but two applications that are made of this text. Believers in endless punishment generally apply it to a day of general judgment, when the Lord Jesus shall make his appearance to be glorified in his saints, and sentence the wicked to endless punishment. Those who deny that the doctrine of endless punishment is taught in the scriptures, apply it to the destruction of Jerusalem. To the latter application of this passage, I have three objections:

1. The church at Thessalonica was not composed of Jews, but principally of devout Greeks and converted heathen. "Hence," says Dr. Clarke, "we find in the epistle but few allusions to the Jews, and but few references to the peculiarities of their civil or religious institutions."

2. This church was situated too far from Jerusalem to be materially affected by the judgments which befell this devoted city. Thessalonica was a city in Europe distant nearly one thousand miles from the noise and blood of the siege that proved the overthrow of the Jews."

3. The declaration of the apostle in the second chapter of this epistle *utterly forbids* the application of this text to the destruction of Jerusalem. In his first Epistle he had spoken of the second advent of Christ, and it seems that some at least, supposed that it was about to take place. But he writes again unto them, and takes occasion to set them right on this subject. And how does he do it? by informing them that he only meant that Jerusalem would be destroyed by the Romans? No! He reassures them of the *fact* that Christ is to come again, but proceeds to inform them that the event is not about to take place as some supposed. He says, "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God!"

This man of sin, who must be revealed before Christ could come, is considered by commentators generally to mean *Papacy*, which was not revealed till centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem. Therefore, it is *certain* that the text under consideration cannot refer to that event; but it must refer to the coming of Christ to punish the ungodly, and to be glorified in his saints in the end of this world.

If my limits would permit, I should like to introduce the testimony of all the apostles, but time will not allow it. I hasten to inquire,

IV. *Were the Christian's fathers, who lived in, and immediately after, the days of the Apostles, believers in the doctrine of endless punishment?*

If those who were converted to Christianity by the Apostles, and who associated with them in the christian ministry, and others who lived immediately after their time, were believers in the doctrine of endless punishment, the fact will go far to prove that the apostles were believers and advocates of this doctrine. I do not appeal to the fathers as *doctrinal*, but as *historical* authority. If Christ and his apostles were believers in no future punishment, and that all men will be finally holy and happy, the apostles of course would not have omitted to instruct the churches collected by them, in such important doctrines, for no faithful Universalist preacher would fail in this part of his duty.

This being the case, we should expect to find a clear statement of these sentiments in the early christian writings, especially of those fathers who were cotemporary with, or immediately succeeding the apostles. But this is so far from being the case, that the nearer we approach the apostolic age, the less do we find of any thing that looks like such sentiments." The writings of Barnabas, (the companion of St. Paul,) Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, who were cotemporary with the apostles, have come down to us; also the writings of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Irenæus, Theophilus, and others. Now where, we ask, in the writings of all the fathers is to be found that there is no future and eternal punishment? Where have they once said that all mankind will be finally holy and happy? Universalists do not pretend to find these sentiments in their writings, but on the contrary, they admit that the fathers prior to A. D. 196 maintained the opposite sentiment. H. Ballou 2d. in *History of Universalism*, p. 67, says in reference to those who lived and wrote prior to A. D. 196, that nearly all allude to, or expressly assert a future judgment, and a future state of punishment, seven call it the *everlasting*, the *eternal fire torments*. Again he says of them "that there was a future state of suffering, they all agreed, p. 83."

I might make extracts from accredited translations of the fathers, showing that they fully believed and taught the doctrine of endless punishment; but one only shall suffice. Jus-

tin Martyr wrote his apologies for the Christians about 50 years from the death of St. John. In stating the belief of Christians to the Roman Emperor, he says, "And moreover we say, that the souls of the wicked, being reunited to the same bodies, shall be consigned over to *eternal torments*, and not, as Plato would have it, to the period of a thousand years only ; but if you will affirm this to be incredible, or impossible, there is no help, but you must fall from error to error till the day of judgment convinces you that we are right."

I will now bring this argument to a close, by stating what has been proved.

1st. It has been proved from the admissions and testimonies of Universalist authors, that the doctrine of endless punishment was generally believed by Jews and Gentiles in the days of Christ and his apostles.

2d. It has been affirmed that Christ and his apostles *never, in a single instance*, opposed either Jew or Gentile on account of this doctrine, which we are told is "worse than all the other errors put together," nor were they ever known to warn their followers against it ; and farther, that no instance can be found in which they were opposed for preaching the opposite doctrine. I call on my opponent to give us one instance of the kind from the whole New Testament, only one — this he cannot do.

3d. It has been proved that Christ and his apostles, so far from opposing this doctrine, imbodyed their sentiments in reference to the punishment of the wicked, in the same language employed by the Jews to express endless punishment.

4th. It has been proved that the churches gathered by the apostles were, so far as is known, believers in endless punishment.

I conclude, therefore, that the doctrine of endless punishment was taught by Christ and his apostles, and is, consequently, the doctrine of the Bible.

DISCUSSION,

PART I. No. II.

IN THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, MARCH 15, 1843.

BY E. FRANCIS.

REJOINDER.

“ He that is first in his own cause seemeth just ; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.”

PROV. xviii. 17.

I HAVE selected this language of the wise man, as a suitable motto for my rejoinder to the discourse to which you have listened from my brother in the ministry, yet of an opposite faith in some important points.

And here it is proper that I should remark, that this controversy is not one of my seeking. The challenge, if such it may be called, came from my brother, and, as it is my pleasure and my duty to speak in behalf of the “ doctrine once delivered to the saints,” and which is nearly “every where spoken against” in the religious world, I should be recreant to my calling, did I refuse to meet what I deem error, with the sword of God’s truth.

My prayer to the great Father of spirits, is, that I may be enabled to proceed in my investigations and remarks with candor; that I may be kept from exhibiting any other disposition, than that of my master; and that the grand object before my mind, shall be, to learn ‘*what is truth.*’

My brother, after delivering his introduction, has presented the discourse under four separate divisions. I propose to reply in the same order.

I agree with him that the questions we are discussing, are of the highest importance; and that it is to the Holy Bible all "must turn, not only to learn the *fact*, but also the *character* of the future existence."

I do not feel willing to allow the assertion, that only "*some few in these latter days*," declare that, "the Bible does not teach what the most pious and learned men of all ages of the christian church have believed" concerning *endless punishment*. But, as one *assertion* is of as much weight as another; I meet this with the declaration that there have been "biblical students," all along through these "1800 years" past, who have not only "*discovered*," but rejoiced in and published to the world, the truth "that all mankind will be finally holy and happy." And this fact I am prepared to prove, as also the heathen origin of the commonly received sentiment, in the religious world, that "some part or portion of the human family, will be endlessly miserable." But this is not required by our question, which makes the *Sacred Scriptures the test*; and not the *opinions* of those whose outer tabernacles have long since crumbled away to dust.

I agree with my brother that we must "*try the spirits*," and "if any man bring to us any other gospel, than that preached by Christ and his apostles, we are bound to reject it."

Methinks I might with propriety style my brother and his co-workers "*new teachers*," since his denomination cannot trace its existence as such, I believe, much over one century.

I. The first question, in my brother's discourse, that forms a particular division, is this — "*Was the doctrine of endless punishment believed by both Jews and Gentiles in the days of Christ and his Apostles?*" He has quoted from *Universalist writers*, sufficiently, to convince the most doubting, that we acknowledge its truth; and further, he has presented testimony from our authors, that the doctrine came *not from God*, but that it was a PAGAN NOTION.

He does not deny its *heathenish origin*. As he has quoted "*Balfour*," among others, as authority, I will quote *the same*

language with a few sentences preceding and succeeding it. After fixing two important points in reply to a question which he proposes, he says, "Again, it is stated by Dr. Campbell, and others, that during, and after the Babylonish captivity, the Jews came to learn from the heathen, the notion of endless punishment in a future state. This we have seen above. The introduction of this, and other heathen opinions among the Jews, was gradual, but in the days of our Lord had become general, with perhaps the exception of the sect of the Sadducees. But though they learned from the heathen this notion of a place of endless punishment, they could not learn from them, to call it by the name Gehenna, for this was a Hebrew term."

GEHENNA, I should remark, is a word that "is uniformly rendered the valley of Hinnom, throughout the Old Testament; it occurs in the New Testament twelve times, and is rendered hell every time by the English translators and by Luther, though it is seldom so rendered in any foreign version.—As the name of a well known place near Jerusalem, it is as improper to render it hell, as it would be to render 'Babylon,' or 'Egypt' by the word hell."

Enough has now been said upon this first division, to which I cheerfully assent.

II. My brother's second position, is in defence of this question: "*Was Christ or his apostles who lived and preached in the midst of believers in endless misery, ever known to oppose this doctrine; or were they ever opposed by others for believing and preaching the contrary doctrine?*"

My brother says "the doctrine of endless punishment is either true or false." No one will dispute this. He tells us how he conceives it must have originated, if it is *false*. And as I have already said, I cannot discover that he pretends to deny its false—its heathen birth or invention. He does not, I believe, tell us from whence it came if *true*. Probably the inference was intended to be drawn, that it came from the ALL-WISE JEHOVAH. "To the law and to the testimony" we must then look as the criterion.

The feelings of Universalists, towards the sentiment we are considering, my brother has faithfully proclaimed to you, with

some of our reasons for cherishing them. He then argues: "On the supposition that Christ and his apostles had as much feeling for human woe, and were as capable of judging of the effects of this doctrine, which prevailed to such an extent in their day," as we have, "it would be expected of them, that they would have opposed such an error."

And he further thinks it "strange, passing strange," that Christ and his apostles "no where in their history," so far as he can learn, "ever raised a single note of alarm against it." This is a bold assertion—is it the fact? Under his first head my brother quotes from "Fernald." I quote the same language with a portion of its context, in reply to the position I am now noticing. "*The doctrine of endless punishment is expressly contradicted by the Holy Scriptures.* With reference to this, we must consider the acknowledged difficulty of proving a negative. The Scriptures rather tell us what is true, than labor to explode what is *not* true."

"The Pharisees, it is well known, believed in the endless punishment of human souls. Their doctrine was, that the souls of the wicked, at death, passed immediately into a state of never ending torment. Yet our Savior (Matt. xvi. 12) said to his disciples, without any reservation, "Beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees!"—a very singular circumstance, if that one doctrine, which is magnified as the very pillar of morality in our day, was the truth of the Almighty. Why should Jesus caution against the doctrine of the Pharisees, so sweepingly and so unreservedly, if they held at least one of the most important, soul-saving truths? They did, unquestionably, teach the doctrine of endless punishment, and yet our Savior said, Beware! And so say we. "Beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees!" Christ and his apostles were not '*silent*' on this subject, but in consequence of their preaching the opposite sentiment they met with trials and afflictions.

Jesus was despised because he was "the friend of sinners." Those old, self-righteous Jews were not willing that such vile creatures, that all should be brought to repentance.

My brother says on this head, at the close of his discourse—"No instance can be found in which they [the disciples] were opposed for preaching the opposite doctrine,"—i. e. the final salvation of all men. He says, "I call upon my opponent to

give us one instance of the kind from the whole New Testament — *only one*. This he cannot do." Well, my friends, I will produce *one instance*, and will submit to your candid judgment whether it meets the case or not. 1 Timothy iv. 10. "*For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those that believe.*" I need offer no comments. Paul the apostle, gives his own reason, why they suffered reproach.

I have thus replied to the second position of the discourse, and have shown that we have no reason to suppose that Christ or his apostles, from any thing they suffered, or any thing they did *not* say, believed in the doctrine of endless punishment, or, that it is the doctrine of the Bible.

III. "*I come now to the third inquiry;*" and this is the most important division. On this, the question under discussion comes directly into consideration. "*Is the doctrine of endless punishment for any part or portion of the human family taught in the Scriptures?*"

My brother presents the subject under the following question:

"*Did Christ and his apostles use such language in their discourses and writings as was used by believers in endless punishment in reference to that subject?*" An affirmative answer to this question, appears to be *assumed*; for my brother so far from attempting to present language commonly used by the believers in endless punishment as descriptive of their views; and then presenting testimony of the same kind, from the teachings of Christ and the apostles, — says, "They did not spend their time in laboring to prove what every body admitted to be true." And further — "If I can show that they took the same course, and used the same language in reference to this subject, as those who are admitted to be believers in endless punishment, my point will be gained."

1. In support of this last declaration he speaks first of the character of the Savior's teaching. He introduces a case in illustration of his theme, and quotes freely from *Matt.* 7th chapter; he also mentions the supposed preacher's text, and gives an outline of his discourse. It is not necessary that I should notice this further than to remark, that Universalists

profess to receive the teachings of Christ as truth; and that we believe in the necessity of repentance, true, sincere repentance; as firmly as any christians. I might off-set the illustration by another of the same sort, though to his mind, perhaps, opposite in its main features. But he does not present his supposed case, I believe, as *proof* of the affirmative of his question, therefore it is not my duty to examine the Scriptures quoted, in this place. I will only add, that as I have learned Christ and the apostles, they preached differently from what is represented in the illustration; to be sure he has strung passages from different parts of the bible together; but that amounts to nothing if they are perverted from their true meaning. Hardly one of those passages, will he or his fellow believers, rely upon as proof of their doctrine of endless punishment.

We come now to those passages from the Savior's teachings, that my brother conceives, to be the strongest proofs of his sentiment of endless punishment. They are found in Luke xvi. 22 — 26: Luke xii. 4, 5: Mark ix. 43, 44, and Matthew xxv. 31 — 46. Four distinct passages: these he gives us as proof texts of the "*endless punishment of a part or portion of the human family*." Now what think you, my friends, when we declare unto you that three of these are *parables*;—three out of the *four* passages. The parable of the *Rich Man and Lazarus*; the parable of the *Offending Hand*; and the parable of the *Sheep and Goats*.

And what are parables? Are they literal histories of facts, and circumstances that have transpired, or will take place? None will presume to make such an assertion I think. The word *parable* signifies an allegory, a fable, a fictitious narration. Bishop Lowth describes a parable thus,—"it is that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of a fictitious event, applied by way of simile, to the illustration of some important truth." The parable of the poor man and his ewe lamb, related by the prophet Nathan to king David, (2 Samuel xii. 1 — 6) is a beautiful illustration, of the use that are made of them strikingly to illustrate and enforce important truths. Now no one would think of interpreting that fable as a literal fact. The parables of Christ were drawn chiefly from the manners, customs, occupations, and views of the Jews.

Sometimes he made them to conform to the religious prejudices and superstitions of the Israelites, yet without endorsing these superstitions as truth. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus is of this description.

All the doctrinal and moral truths and principles of the gospel are revealed by the Savior in plain, distinct and literal language, without figure or parable. Parables are not *actual histories*. The Savior uttered them simply to illustrate and bring more directly to the comprehension of his hearers, truths which he, in other instances, expressed in the most distinct and literal language. These remarks we wish the hearer to keep in remembrance, as they have a general application to the parables presented for our examination. Luke xvi. 22 — 26. The parable commences with the 19th verse, and closes with the 31st. My brother's quotation, however, commences with the 22d verse. "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom; and he cried and said, father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence."

My brother says, on this parable: "The object of this quotation is to show that Christ used such language as was used by the Jews," in reference to future and eternal punishment." And in proof of this he quotes at length from Josephus, who discoursed to the GREEKS — Heathens — Pagans — on the notion of Hades, or, as it is translated, hell. Well, what if Christ did use similar language, for the purpose of illustrating and setting forth, in a forcible manner, to the understanding of his hearers, some great truth he wished to impress upon their minds. Does that prove that he acknowledged such language or such ideas as literally true? not unless he applies it to the

same object. Well, does Christ apply this parable to the future state of existence? This is assumed. My brother does not show how Christ does this. I call for proof upon this point. What is there in the parable itself or its connection, that will convince us that it is a description of endless punishment? Why, the word *hades* is found in the 23d verse; and *hades* or hell as it is translated, is supposed to be decisive evidence of a place of endless punishment having been prepared for a "part or portion of the human family."

We are told that by Abraham's bosom, is meant "that part of the world of departed souls, prepared for the *just*." It was there that the Angels carried Lazarus. We would like to know what right Lazarus had there, if he was a *just man in this world*? From aught the record tells us, he might have been heir to large estates, and by a course of profligacy and wickedness, become diseased in body, and so poverty stricken as to be forced to beg for a morsel of bread, to sustain a miserable life. By *hades* we are told is meant "that part of the invisible world in which the souls of the *unjust* are retained until the" day of general judgment. When that is to be nobody knows.

We wish to know what great crime the rich man had committed, that should doom him to this place? The record makes no charge against him, only that he was *RICH* in this world's goods, it does not tell us he was *unjust*, for aught we know he might have been one of the most charitable, kind-hearted, and benevolent individuals that ever lived. My brother, perhaps, has some knowledge about this matter that I have not.

I will offer a remark or two upon the word *hades*, and leave this parable, as time will not be sufficient to examine it thoroughly.

Upon the word *Hades* I presume my brother rests his argument. This word occurs *eleven* times in the New Testament, and is in every instance save *one*, translated by the English term *hell*. *Hades* is a Greek word that corresponds with the Hebrew word *Sheol*; and in almost every instance throughout the Old Testament the *LXX*, who made what is denominated the Septuagint translation, about 277 years before Christ, have translated the original Hebrew *Sheol* by the Greek *Hades*.

In order therefore to learn the true meaning of the word *Hades* in the New Testament, we must ascertain its meaning in the Old Testament.

Now these words in the Old Testament, never signify a place of literal torment. The original and true meaning of these words, have reference to the state of the dead, without any reference to their happiness or misery—the place to which the Jews believed the souls of all the dead went when they left the body. This is the sole and invariable meaning of these words. I do not think my brother will pretend to deny this.

Dr. Whitby says — “Sheol throughout the Old Testament, and Hades in the Septuagint, answering to it, signify, not the place of punishment, or of the souls of bad men only, but the grave only, or the place of death.” Much other testimony of like character, might be produced if necessary. The one to which I alluded is 1 Cor. xv. 55 — where *hades* is translated *grave*. “O grave [*hades*] where is thy victory?” It would have been just as proper to have used the word *hell* as the translation of *hades*, in this instance, as in any other portion of the New Testament. My brother will not deny this.

I must hasten to his second proof text. Luke xii. 4, 5. “And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that, have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear : Fear him which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell ; yea I say unto you, Fear him.” This my brother has connected with the parable of the Offending Hand. He says nothing upon the passage itself, to prove that it has particular reference to the sentiment, that a part or portion of the human family will suffer “endless punishment.” He assumes that the word Hell, here, refers to another world. The original *word* in this passage is *Gehenna*, and the same word occurs in his third proof text, which I will presently notice. Upon this passage in Luke, I need only remark, that I believe as firmly as any in the *infinite power of God*.

It will be seen by examining the connection, and more par-

ticularly the account which Matthew has given, (ch. x.) that Jesus having called the *twelve disciples*, and given them their mission, proceeded to give them certain instructions which he deemed needful, and further he tells them whom they *should fear, and whom they should not fear* ; viz. — that they should not fear human tribunals, those men whose power was limited ; but they should fear the great God ; that Being who is all powerful — who is infinite. Enough, however, upon this passage.

III. The next proof text is Mark ix. 43, 44. “ And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off : it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched : where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Upon this and the former passage, my brother gives “ two reasons” why the Jews “ could not have understood Jesus as speaking of the *grave*.” They are good reasons, such as I suppose any Universalist would give. I agree with him, there is no reference to the grave. He introduces another extract from Josephus in further proof of the opinions of the Jews concerning *hades*. And triumphantly calls upon his opponent, to answer this question : he says, “ Here we see that Christ employs their own phraseology, that with which they were familiar, and with what propriety or consistency, I ask, if he did not allow the doctrine ?” Well, my friends, I am not disposed to answer this question ; for the very good reason that the original word in the two passages rendered *hell*, is not *hades*, but *Gehenna*. My brother has made a slight mistake in reference to the passage under consideration. The English word *hell* is used by our translators, for four different words in the Bible ; namely, *Sheol* a *Hebrew word*, and of course always found in the Old Testament, and occurs in 64 instances ; in 32 it is rendered *hell*, and in the other 32 it is rendered *pit* and *grave*. *Hades* is a Greek translation of *Sheol*, and always has the same meaning. We have already spoken of these two words. The other two words are *Tartarus* and *Gehenna*. The former *Tartarus* does not really occur at all, but a denominative verb derived from it, which is rendered ‘ *cast down to hell*.’ It is found only *once*, in 2 Peter ii. 4. *Gehenna* occurs 12 times, and is uniformly rendered *hell*. I have already spoken of this word in the first division

of my discourse. My brother applies it to another world; or rather the passage under consideration. His argument was intended to have a special bearing upon this parable of the Offending Hand — yes, this fable, fictitious narration, or allegory, designed by the Savior to illustrate some important truth. The inquiry that presents itself then, is, what was the object of Jesus in addressing his disciples thus? We answer — that it was to warn his followers of the necessity of casting aside every personal habit or gratification, that could prove an obstacle to their giving themselves up wholly to the service of their Master. This will be learned from the context.

By the words enter into life, we conceive the Savior to signify an entrance into the belief of the gospel. In support of this idea I will quote from John vi. 63, where Jesus said on a certain occasion, “The *words* that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are *life*.” Again, he exclaimed, John v. 24, “Verily, verily I say unto you, he that heareth my *word*, and believeth on him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is passed* from death unto *life*.”

But what does *Hell* or *Gehenna* mean, “where the worm dieth not and the fire never shall be quenched?”

The word *Gehenna* is derived from two Greek [Hebrew] words, which being united make *Gee Hinnom*, (Gehenna) the valley of Hinnom. Professor Stewart informs us that it is a part (the eastern section) of the pleasant wadi, or valley, which bounds Jerusalem on the south. “Here, in ancient times, and under some of the idolatrous kings, the worship of Molock, the horrid idol god of the Ammorites, was practised. To this idol children were offered in sacrifice.” “It was hollow within; and being heated by fire, children were laid in its arms, and were there literally roasted alive.” “After these [idolatrous] sacrifices had ceased, the place was desecrated and made one of loathing and horror. The pious king Josiah caused it to be polluted — that is, he caused to be carried there the filth of Jerusalem. It would seem that the custom of desecrating this place, thus happily begun, was continued, in after ages, down to the period when our Savior was on earth. *Perpetual fires* were kept up, in order to consume the offal

which was deposited there." In time, it came to be the place where criminals were executed by *burning to death*. The Jews therefore, viewed this Gehenna with great dislike and horror. Schleusner tells us that "every severe punishment, and particularly every ignominious kind of death, was called by the name of *Gehenna*" — or hell.

There is no proof that the Savior, or the Jews of his day, ever used the word to signify a place of endless wretchedness. We should understand the phrase, "where their worm dieth not," &c. as indicative of the intensity of the punishments inflicted. Prof. Stuart says, "Perpetual fires were kept up [in the valley of Hinnom, or Gehenna] in order to consume the offal that was deposited there. And as the same offal would breed worms, (for so all putrifying meat of course does,) hence came the expression, *where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched*."

We therefore understand the words, "cast into hell," or "go into hell" figuratively, as becoming involved in calamities and woes, in consequence of sinful gratifications.

Jesus instructed his disciples that it was their duty to put away all habits, practices, and inclinations that would interfere with duty, and enter into the life and enjoyment of the gospel, rather than by neglecting duty, apostatize from their Master, and become involved in the dreadful woes which were soon to come upon the Jews for their wickedness.

We are informed by historians that those who apostatized were involved in the calamities that soon after overwhelmed the Jewish nation. They were cast into *Gehenna*, into a scene of distress, and suffering, and awful horror, such as the world has never witnessed in any other instance. But enough — excepting in one case, *Gehenna*, was never used by any New Testament writer beside our Savior; and it never occurs in the Gospel of John, in the Acts and preachings of the Apostles, nor in all the Epistles of Peter, Paul, John and Jude; and yet this is the word, the *only* word, which our opposers rely on as the name of their supposedly endless hell, in the original Scriptures!!! I have spoken at greater length upon this parable than I at first intended.

IV. I pass to the fourth proof text. The parable of the Sheep and Goats — Matt. xxv. 31 — 46.

This my brother says is an important passage in the discussion. He wishes the hearer to keep in mind certain facts. I wish the hearer also to keep in mind certain facts. Remember that this is a *parable*. That it was one of several which Jesus delivered to his disciples in reply to certain questions *they asked him*.

The question before us is — Does this allegory “teach the doctrine of endless punishment for any part or portion of the human family?” My brother asserts that it does, and has endeavored to prove that it is specially applicable to the future world. He says — “We have already seen that *the Jews* must have understood the Savior as speaking of the general judgment at the end of this world.”

Where, we would ask, has he shown this? But let this pass. It so happens that this parable was spoken not to the Jews, but to the *Disciples* as my brother may learn by consulting Matt. xxiv. 3. His proof that the passage describes something yet to take place is, that it is to be “When the Son of Man shall come in his glory; which must mean Christ’s second appearing. He quotes four passages which refer to this event, as he thinks. As they are not proof texts on the question under discussion, I need not notice them farther, than to assert that Christ has already made his second advent, which I stand ready to prove. I pass therefore hastily over his conclusions drawn from those passages; he having assumed the ground, that there is to be a day of general judgment; which should first be proved, as something yet to be. The last verse of the parable seems to be the important part. “And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.” It is not necessary that I should declare that the word everlasting does not always signify endless when it occurs in the Bible; this, my brother acknowledges. The true meaning of the word is to be determined from the connection in which it is found. This reward of eternal life and doom of everlasting punishment was to be dispensed at the time of the coming of the Son of Man. By examining the questions in the 3d verse of the xxivth chapter of Matt. it will be found that what follows in that chapter, and what is contained in the xxvth was spoken in reply to them.

The questions were, When shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?

When shall what things be? Why the things of which he had before been speaking; the destruction of the Jewish Temple; and the overthrow of that nation; and the end of the Jewish age. The phrase rendered "*end of the world*," does not signify the end of the material universe;—it is not *Kosmos* but *Aion*, which signifies *age*. We nowhere read in the New Testament of the end of the material world; though we do read of the "*End of the Age*."

It is a fact too well known to require proof, that the Jewish Temple was destroyed; that the nation was overthrown in a dreadful manner by the Roman Armies, more than seventeen centuries ago. At that time the wicked Jews figuratively speaking, went away into everlasting punishment; and the Christian believers entered into life eternal; they enjoyed the special blessings promised them here; while those unbelievers, the Jews suffered the judgment pronounced upon them. And they still suffer it; they are despised and persecuted in our own day.

My brother having presented these three parables of the Savior with the passage in Luke xii. proceeds to quote one passage from the Epistles of Paul in support of the affirmative of the question.

Before noticing that, I wish to call your attention to the fact that his proofs, have not been accompanied, with that which is equivalent to a "Thus saith the Lord." They have been drawn mainly from three parables, which if they are to be interpreted *figuratively* in one part should be so in all, and if *literally* in one part they should be so in all.

5. The fifth passage quoted is 2 Thessalonians i. 7—9. "And to you which are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power."

My brother says this must refer to a time yet future. He urges three objections to the supposition that it may refer to

the Jewish overthrow. 1st. That the church in Thessalonica was composed principally of devout Greeks and heathen, and not of Jews. In answer to this objection I will refer my brother to Acts xvii. 1—4, where he will learn that there was a synagogue of the Jews at Thessalonica, and that *some of them were converted* under Paul's preaching, &c.

2d. He objects that they were 1000 or more miles distant from Jerusalem. I reply, that proves nothing: for were not *all* the Jews, and Christians, wherever scattered abroad, effected by the destruction of that nation?

3d. He objects that in the second chapter of the epistle we read that there should be a falling away first, and that the man of sin should be revealed, the Son of perdition; and this he tells us signifies Papacy, which did not rise until several centuries afterwards. To this I reply, that the application is assumed;—he gives no conclusive reason why this should be said to refer to the Romish Church.

The 6th verse of the chapter tells us who were the persons that were to be punished—"Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation *to them that trouble you.*" No other persons than those who troubled the Thessalonian believers, had or can have any part or lot in the matter of the punishment. It is true that those believers suffered much at the hands of their own countrymen—but it is plain that the unbelieving Jews at Thessalonica were the *instigators* thereof, as well as the *principal persecutors* in person. This is obvious from Acts xvii. 5—9, and 1 Thess. ii. 14—16, 2. Thess. i. 10, is as follows: "When he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired by all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) *in that day.*" This then fixes the time.

Paul speaks of "the mystery of iniquity as being *already* at work when he wrote. He declares that the events by him spoken of should occur *when the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven—when he should come*; Luke xvii. 30, 31, is to the point. "Even thus it shall be *in the day when the Son of Man is revealed.*" IN THAT DAY, he which shall be upon the housetop, and his stuff in the house, let him not come down to take

it away ; and he that is in the field, let him likewise not return back. Similar directions are given in Matt. xxiv. 15 — 18, and in Luke xxi. 20 -- 23 ; in all which places the time of tribulation to Jerusalem is obviously referred to — “ *When he shall come.*” See Matt. x. 23 ; xvi. 27, 28 ; xxiv. 29, 30.

But enough, — I have shown, I believe, who are the persons signified and the time when they were to be punished. I need not now pursue the subject further.

IV. My brother’s fourth division in his discourse has reference to this question. “ Were the Christian Fathers who lived in and immediately after the days of the apostles, believers in the doctrine of endless punishment ? ”

I need not devote any time to examine this portion of the discourse. It is not necessary that I should now produce testimony from the early Fathers, in proof that *some of them (at least)* did not believe in the doctrine of endless punishment ; among them the pious and learned Origen. If the *Scriptures* teach the doctrine my brother endeavors to maintain, it is not important that this latter question should be found in the affirmative or negative.

I leave this subject with the prayer that my mind may be led into all truth ; and not only I, but all present, yea, the whole intelligent creation of God.—AMEN.

DISCUSSION,

PART I. No. III.

IN THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, APRIL 4, 1843.

BY F. YATES.

IN support of the affirmative of the first part of this conjoint question, I endeavored to show, on a previous occasion, that the teachings of Christ and his apostles were calculated, not only to confirm believers in the doctrine of endless punishment, but to lead others to regard this as a prominent point in their faith. It was shown in my discourse, and admitted by my opponent, that the doctrine of endless punishment was generally believed by Jews and Gentiles in the DAYS of Christ and his apostles. It was thought, that, if this prevailing doctrine, which its opposers regard as "worse than all other errors put together," were not the doctrine of him who came to "*bear witness of the truth*," that he would have distinctly opposed it, as "injurious to good morals, and destructive to human happiness." It was affirmed that *such* opposition could not be found, in a single instance. It was further shown, that, instead of opposing this doctrine, Christ and his apostles used such language, when speaking of the punishment of the wicked, as was used by believers in endless punishment, and which cannot now be consistently interpreted to teach anything short of this doctrine. It was further shown, that the churches gathered

by the apostles, and instructed by them in the doctrines of christianity, were, so far as is known, believers in endless punishment.

I. I now come to notice the reply made by my opponent to these arguments.—He does not seem “willing to allow, that only ‘some few, in these latter days,’ declare that “the Bible does not teach, what the most pious and learned men of all ages of the christian church have believed, concerning endless punishment;” but asserts that “biblical students, ‘all along, through these ‘1800 years,’ have not only ‘discovered,’ but rejoiced in, and published to the world, the truth that all mankind will be finally holy and happy.” And he thinks he “might style” me and my co-workers ‘new teachers, since” my “denomination cannot trace its existence, as such, much over one century.” Certainly he will not style us “new teachers” in reference to the doctrine of endless punishment, for Universalists admit that many of the early Christian Fathers taught this doctrine.

But how old is Universalism, pray? In the Modern History of Universalism, p. 318, John Murray is styled the “*father of Universalism*,” who commenced his public life in 1770. Can the child be older than its parent? But the system as it is now advocated, cannot claim so near a relation to John Murray as a child. Not a single doctrine peculiar to Mr. Murray’s creed can be found in the present system of Universalism. “He believed in the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ, in original sin, in regeneration, and in *endless* punishment. He believed that the curse of the law was endless death; that all men were justly exposed to it, and that from this Christ came to redeem men. He believed salvation to be deliverance from deserved punishment.”* The present system can trace its origin no farther than Hosea Ballou of Boston, and finds its true date in 1818. So much for his “*assertion*.”

He *admits* my first point — that the doctrine of endless punishment was generally believed in the time of Christ, and declares that it had its origin among the heathen. This I *deny*,

* See M. H. Smith’s Lectures, p. 231.

and call for proof. The law of God first given to man, I regard as the first announcement of this doctrine.

II. He next attempts to answer my second inquiry — Was Christ or his apostles, who lived and preached in the midst of believers in endless misery, ever known to oppose this doctrine; or were they ever opposed for believing and preaching the contrary doctrine?

I contended, and do *still* contend, that if this doctrine be not of God, Christ and his apostles would have borne a faithful testimony against it; that they would at least have been sufficiently clear on this subject to let their followers know what is truth. In my first discourse, I stated, that nowhere, in their history, do we learn that they ever raised a note of alarm against the doctrine of endless punishment. This my opponent calls “*a bold assertion*,” and asks if it is true.

In reply, he makes the following quotation from W. M. Fernald: “*The doctrine of endless punishment is expressly contradicted by the holy scriptures.* The Pharisees, it is well known, believed in the endless punishment of human souls. Their doctrine was, that the souls of the wicked, at death, passed immediately into a state of never-ending torment. Yet our Savior (Matt. xvi. 12,) said to his disciples, *without any reservation*, ‘Beware’ of the doctrine of the Pharisees.”

This may be quite satisfactory to those who are in the habit of taking every thing on credit, without reading for themselves. He has produced a solitary text to prove his “bold assertion” that “the doctrine of endless punishment is *expressly* contradicted in the holy scriptures!” Now let us examine this text, and see if it sustains his point. Let us read the verse which contains his proof text. “Then understood they how he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees *and of the Sadducees.*” Why did he stop in his quotation where there is not so much as a comma? Because if he had continued to the period it would have destroyed his object, for the Sadducees did not believe in future punishment. This Universalists admit. Allow me the liberty with this text that my opponent has taken, and by leaving out the Pharisees,

I will prove to you that the Savior warned his disciples against *Universalism*. I will take the argument of Mr. Fernald.

“*The doctrine that there is no endless punishment is expressly contradicted by holy scriptures.*” With reference to this, we must consider the acknowledged difficulty of proving a negative. The scriptures rather tell us what *is* true, than labor to explode what is *not* true.” The “Sadducees” it is well known believed in “no” endless punishment for human souls. Their doctrine was, that the wicked, at death, “did not go” into a state of never-ending torment. “Yet our Savior (Matt. xvi. 12) said to his disciples, without any reservation, ‘Beware’ of the doctrine of the Sadducees! — a very singular circumstance, if that one doctrine, which is magnified as the very pillar of morality, in our day, was the truth of the Almighty.” Thus you see the sophistry of his reasoning.

Again, Mr. Fernald and my opponent tell us that this warning was made “*without any reservation; i. e. all the doctrines held by the Pharisees were contradicted by our Lord!* — I presume my opponent will readily admit that the Pharisees believed in the existence of God, and the future and endless bliss of the saints. And yet he asks: “Why should Jesus caution against the doctrine of the Pharisees, *so sweepingly, and so unreservedly*, if they held at least one of the most important, and soul-saving truths?”!!!

But our Savior tells us *definitely*, what this doctrine is against which he warned his disciples: “He began to say unto his disciples first of all, Beware of the leaven* of the Pharisees, *which is HYPOCRISY.*” (Luke xii. 1.) This will be seen also by reading Matt. xvi, from which his proof text is taken. The controversy on this text must now be at an end. This, I have no doubt, my opponent will have the candor to acknowledge. As this is the only text that has been produced to prove that the Bible “expressly contradicts” the doctrine of endless punishment, my position, that Christ and his apostles nowhere oppose this doctrine, remains unanswered.

Next he makes a bold assertion, which remains to be proved: “Christ and his apostles were not *silent* on this subject,

* The Savior used the term *leaven* in both cases.

but in consequence of preaching the opposite sentiment, they met with trials and afflictions." This he *assumes*; let him *prove* it.

In answer to my call for a single instance where they were opposed for preaching that all mankind will be finally holy and happy, he has produced the following passage: "1 Timothy iv. 10. For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, *because we trust in the LIVING GOD*, who is the Savior of all men, *especially* of those that believe." This is the only text that he produced in answer to my call; and this he read without comments.

It was evidently designed to make the impression, that the apostles suffered reproach for believing or preaching that all men will be saved in a future state. But is there any thing like this in the text? Let us see. "We both labor and suffer reproach." For what reason? "*because we trust in the LIVING GOD.*" The phrase *living God*," is applied in scripture to the true God, to distinguish him from the dead gods of the heathen." 1 Thess. i. 9. "And how ye turned to God from *idols*, to serve the *living and true God.*" It was for this they suffered reproach, while laboring among the worshippers of idols. It is added: "Who is the Savior of all men, *especially of those that believe.*" He is the Savior of all men, inasmuch as he has provided salvation for *all*, and has invited *all* to "*come*" and "*be saved.*" But especially is he the Savior of those that *believe*. Universalism asserts that all men will be finally holy and happy; but the text teaches no such doctrine. It asserts a fact in the present tense.

Thus far, my opponent has failed to produce a single text in which the doctrine of endless punishment is distinctly opposed in the Bible.

I now renew my call for a *single instance* from the whole New Testament, in which Christ or his apostles opposed the doctrine of endless punishment, or were opposed by others for preaching the contrary doctrine—only one. This he cannot produce.

III. I come now to review his reply to my *third* inquiry: "Did Christ and his apostles use such language in their dis-

courses, and writings as was used by believers in endless punishment, in reference to that subject."

In reply to my observations on this point, he says that "an affirmative answer to this question *appears* to be assumed." After I had given extracts from *Josephus*, containing the language employed by the Jews in reference to endless punishment, and showing that they believed in a general judgment at the end of this world, my opponent starts up and inquires, "where, we would ask, has he shown this?" When he made this inquiry he had before him in my manuscript, extracts from *Josephus*, containing the following passage: "At whose *judgment seat*, where all men, and angels, and demons shall stand, they will send forth one voice, and say, *JUST IS THY JUDGMENT*; the rejoinder to which will bring a just sentence upon both parties, by giving justly to those who have done well, an everlasting fruition; but allotting to the lovers of wicked works eternal punishment. To these belong the unquenchable fire, and that without end, and a certain fiery worm, never dying." I will now leave our hearers to judge of the pertinency of his question.

It was *proved* in my discourse that Jesus Christ and his apostles used the same language when speaking of the punishment of the wicked, as was employed by believers in endless punishment to express that doctrine. This my opponent does not pretend to deny. Nay, *he admits it!* After *assuming* that my proof texts are parables, he remarks, "the parables of Christ, were drawn chiefly, from the manners, customs, occupations, and *views* of the Jews. Sometimes he made them to conform to the religious prejudices and superstitions of the Israelites, yet without endorsing their superstitions as truth. The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus is of this description."

Here then, is an *admission* of all I contend for, Jesus Christ made his mode of teaching to conform to the "views of the Jews;" but that he could do this without endorsing their sentiments, I do not admit. On this principle, how can it be proved that Jesus taught that there is an endless heaven? he "conforms to the religious prejudices and superstitions of the Israelites" in reference to this subject.

On this point I beg leave to introduce an extract from a Ser-

mon of REV. DR. FISK, late President of the Wesleyan University :

“The Jews held the endless punishment of the wicked. This may be abundantly proved from the rabbinical writings, and from the targums. And if this were an error of that people, which from the corruptions of the church, they had run into, why did not our Lord and his apostles plainly point out their error, as they did the other errors which had been introduced? why did they use the very terms which the Jews used, to express the eternal torments of the wicked, and that too, when speaking of that very subject, and yet not explain their meaning? No man in his senses, I think, can deny, that by this course they either designedly left them in the dark upon this subject, yea, designedly confirmed them in their error, or else they meant to give their authority to this doctrine. * * * If our Lord or his apostles did not intend to confirm the Jews in their error, then they meant to stamp with their authority the doctrine of the endless punishment of the wicked. I see no means of avoiding this conclusion; and the argument must certainly have great weight. It will outweigh a thousand verbal criticisms upon Greek and Hebrew terms. It has certainly been well said, that scripture is to be taken in that sense in which the common people who heard it at first took it. If so, then we are to understand those passages in the New Testament in the manner that the Jews must necessarily have understood them. We have already seen that these terms were understood by the Jews as applying to the endless punishment of the impenitent. This gives the doctrine of the Jews additional weight, while it leads to a clue, which, beyond the power of successful contradiction, will determine that our Lord and his apostles held the same doctrine, and thus they both unite to corroborate it. And this argument gathers more strength from the consideration, that the advocates of the two systems, Jewish and Christian, were at variance. When a new system is introduced to take the place of an old one; in all those points of any importance in which the two disagree, there will be a controversy, as was the case in many instances between Christ and the Jews, the apostles and their countrymen.

But there was no controversy between them on the subject of the duration of punishment. Also, such opposing advocates for different systems will be careful not to use terms that establish what they conceive to be the errors of their opponents; but not only was no such caution used by our Lord and his apostles, but they frequently and commonly used the same terms that the Jews used when speaking on the subject of future punishment, and that without any explanation, or even a hint, that they meant to be understood differently from the current opinion; — *a strong proof that they used the current terms on this subject according to their current meaning.* And the other consideration, that in no other case have they given intimations that such a doctrine which was then prevailing was false, is sufficient, I think, to establish the point, that Jesus Christ and his apostles held the punishment of the wicked the same as the Jews."

This is the ground on which I challenge my opponent. The object of the argument, as first presented, was to prove that Christ and his apostles used the same language employed by the Jews, in reference to endless punishment, and that without the least intimation that they held a contrary doctrine. My opponent allows that they used the phraseology of the Jews in reference to this subject, but makes no attempt to reconcile their conduct in this respect, with the doctrine, that all mankind will be finally holy and happy. He says "they were not *silent* on this subject," but he has failed to produce a single instance in which they bore testimony against the doctrine of endless punishment, while I have produced several instances where they employ the strongest terms used by the advocates of this doctrine, and am prepared to present as many more. I challenge my opponent to produce a single term or phrase employed by the Jews, to express endless punishment, stronger than those used by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

The efforts of my opponent to show that my proof texts do not teach this doctrine, go just as far to prove that the Jews did not believe and teach the doctrine of endless punishment, as they do that our Lord and his apostles were not of this faith! But why has not my opponent met my argument as it was pre-

sented? The object of these texts was to prove that Christ and his apostles must have been understood as teaching the doctrine of endless punishment, inasmuch as they used the same terms employed to express this then prevailing doctrine. This argument he has not met; consequently, I am under no obligation to notice his reply to my proof texts.

But lest he should take advantage of my silence on his explanation of these scriptures, I will give it a passing notice.

After naming the four proof texts produced by me to show that Christ used the language of the Jews in reference to endless punishment, he asks, "now what think you my friends, when we declare unto you that three of these are *Parables*."

But I ask, what evidence has he produced to prove his assertion that three of my proof texts are *Parables*? He made no *attempt* to prove it. It is a bold and unwarrantable assertion, made with as much confidence as though the lip of truth had declared it. "Now what think you my friends, when we declare unto you" that he cannot prove from the texts themselves, or from the whole book of God that they are parables. And yet, this unwarrantable assumption forms the basis of all his remarks on these texts!!! Is this *candid*?

He remarks that "all the doctrine and moral truths and principles of the Gospel are revealed by the Savior in plain, distinct and literal language, without figure or parable." Now let us bring this principle laid down by my opponent to the texts which he calls parables. They are the account of the *Rich Man and Lazarus*, Luke xvi. 22—26 —the *Offending Hand*, and *danger of hell fire*, Mark ix. 43, 44, and the concluding portion of Matt. 25th chapter where it speaks of the Son of Man coming in his glory, with all the holy angels, and that the wicked shall go into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal. Now according to the above principle, all this teaching of the Savior either contains no doctrinal or moral truth, or principle of the gospel, — or it is plain, literal language, and no parable. He can take which horn of the dilemma he chooses.

But now for the texts. My first proof text is Luke xvi. 22, 26, which contains the account of the Rich Man and Lazarus,

given by our Savior. This my opponent calls a *parable*. Where is the proof? But suppose it be a parable? What then? Dr. Clarke says in respect to this passage, that it "is either a *parable* or *real history*. If it be a parable, it is what *may be*: if it be a *history*, it is what *has been*. Either a man *may live* as is here described, and go to perdition when he dies; or, some *have* lived in this way, and are now suffering the torments of an eternal fire. The account is equally instructive in whichever of these lights it is viewed.

But I make the following objections to this being a parable.

1. It is not introduced as such. The Savior commences with saying, "*There was* a certain rich man," &c. He gives all the facts as having actually taken place. But my opponent says there is no such thing. Who shall we believe, Mr. Francis, or the Savior?

2. There is no general feature of this account that is *necessarily* figurative. The language is such as any man would employ in giving a plain narration of facts.

3. It is unlike all other parables. The parables of our Savior are usually figures and circumstances with which the people were familiar — such as the parable of "*the tares and the wheat*" — "*The ten virgins*" — "*The pearl*" — "*The mustard seed*," &c. designed to illustrate high and important truths. But if this be a parable, it is a "fictitious narration" of something — no one knows what.

Until my opponent brings a "*thus saith the Lord*" to prove his assertion that this is a parable, this fearful passage of holy writ stands out in bold relief, as conclusive evidence of the doctrine I advocate. "The Rich man died, and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments." So says Jesus Christ, and who will take the responsibility to contradict him?

He "would like to know what right Lazarus had" in Abraham's bosom? And "he wishes to know what great crime the rich man had committed, that should doom him" to the torments of hell. I will refer him to Jesus Christ on this subject. He may stand up and demand a reason of *the Savior* for his conduct towards these individuals. His complaint about their final destiny may pass to this audience for all it is worth.

In this passage is found language which the Jews used when speaking of endless punishment, employed by the Savior. This my opponent does not deny, but asks, "What if Christ did use similar language for the purpose of illustrating and setting forth in a forcible manner to the understanding of his hearers, some great truth, he wished to impress upon their minds." I call on him to point out a great truth that is illustrated and set forth in a forcible manner, in these passages. What great truth is so much as named, or even alluded to, if he rejects a literal understanding of it? "Does Christ apply this passage" to some great truth, in this "state of existence? This is assumed. Our brother does not show us how Christ does this. I call for proof upon this point."

My next proof text is Luke xii. 4, 5. "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that, have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; yea I say unto you, fear him." In reply to this text, my opponent makes some very good remarks on the duty of fearing God, rather than man, and concludes "It is enough." He "believes in the infinite power of God as much as any one." Does he believe that God has power to punish the soul in hell after the body is dead, if there is no such place? He spares his criticisms on the word here rendered *hell* for the next passages, which he is pleased to call "the parable of the offending hand;" probably thinking he might bring them in there with more *plausibility*. But I am disposed to test his criticisms on this word by this passage. The Greek word that is here translated hell is *Gehenna*; which my brother says is derived from two Greek words, which being united make *Gee Hinnom*." My brother has made a slight mistake here, — *Ge Hinnom* are *Hebrew* words. He thinks that because the word originally signified the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, it cannot be used to mean a place of punishment in another world! But does he contend for the original meaning of *Gehenna* in every instance where it is used by the Savior? Let us see. Speaking of the calamities of the Jews, he says, "*They were cast into Gehenna — into a scene of distress and*

suffering, and awful horror.” I presume my opponent will not contend for a moment, that *Gehenna* in the text under consideration means literally the valley of Hinnom. Now we will see if his other application of the term will work. “Fear him, which *after he hath killed*, hath power to involve you in the calamities which shall come upon the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem”!! That don’t do. The truth is, the punishment threatened in the text must relate to the other world, — it is to be inflicted “*AFTER HE HATH KILLED THE BODY.*” — In the text which he calls “the parable of the offending hand,” the same word occurs, and if it is applied to the future world in one case, it is in the other. It reads as follows: Mark ix. 43, 44. “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that *never* shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.”

This passage my opponent calls a “*fable*,” a “*fictitious narration!*” Let me ask our hearers, what confidence they can place in the teachings of those who can thus *trifle* with the solemn word of Almighty God? — My opponent thinks I have fallen into a slight mistake, because I introduced an extract from Josephus’ discourse on *Hades* in connection with this text, for the word in this text is *Gehenna* and not *Hades*. I think he must have seen, from the words which were *underscored* in that extract, that it was not made in reference to the word *hell*, but in reference to the *undying* worm, and the *unquenchable fire*. Josephus says, in the extract referred to, while speaking of the doom of the wicked after the general judgment, “to these belong the *unquenchable fire*, and that without end, and a certain *fiery worm*, never dying. The Savior in the text under consideration, speaks of going into *Gehenna*, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” — My object was to prove that Jesus Christ used the same language, while speaking of the punishment of the wicked, as did the Jews to express endless punishment. This is proved in the above passages. Again, I ask, with what consistency or propriety, if he did not allow the doctrine? Let my opponent meet this question *fairly*.

But to return. It is clearly proved from the text in Luke, that hell as a place of punishment, is beyond this life; and the text in Mark as clearly proves that the punishment of hell can have no end. So, at least, must the Jews have understood the Savior. My opponent says, "We should understand the phrase, 'where their worm dieth not,' &c. as indicative of the intensity of the punishment inflicted." To this I have no objections.

I cannot consent to leave this part of my subject without noticing the closing paragraph of my opponent concerning *Gehenna*. Here it is. "Excepting in one case, *Gehenna* was never used by any New Testament writer besides the Savior; and it never occurs in the gospel of John, in the acts and proceedings of the apostles, nor in all the epistles of Peter, Paul, John and Jude! and yet this is the word, the *only* word, which our opposers rely on as the name of their supposed endless hell, in the original scriptures!!!"

What, we ask, does all this amount to? No speaker or writer in scripture, uses the term *Gehenna* but Jesus Christ and St. James! yet the great mass of biblical scholars have had the credulity to rely upon it as the name of hell, when they have no higher authority!!! He tells us in another place, that "*Gehenna* occurs 12 times, and is uniformly rendered *hell*." How far does this go towards proving that there is no place of punishment beyond this life? Where did he find authority for saying that *Gehenna* is the *only* word we rely upon as the name of hell? But suppose there is no other term that designates a place of punishment? How many words does he rely upon as the proper name of *heaven* in the original scriptures? Can he mention *one* term that *originally* signified a place of endless happiness? If it can be proved that there is no *hell*, because there is no word used in the scriptures that *originally* signified endless punishment, the same argument will prove that there is no heaven of bliss, for the word used to signify this place originally meant nothing more than the *atmosphere* that belts the earth.

I am prepared to prove that *Gehenna* had come into common use *before* our Savior's advent, to express endless punishment, and they (the Jews) must have understood him as using it in the same sense.

I come now to his remarks on Matt. xxv. 31 — 46. This he calls “the parable of the sheep and goats.” By what authority does he call this the parable of the sheep and goats? Simply this: “And before him (the son of man) shall be gathered *all nations*, and he shall separate *them* (the gathered nations) one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats.” As well might we call the 24th chapter of Matthew “the parable of thunder and lightning,” for “as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the son of man be.”

If a passage of scripture happens to contain a figurative allusion, must the whole passage therefore become a parable? With this rule, the whole New Testament might be turned into parables. The only possible reason why this portion of scripture can be called a parable is, the Savior makes *one allusion* to the shepherd and his flock. This whole passage (which he *assumes* is a parable) is applied by my opponent to the “Destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish nation.” This application was anticipated, and a list of seven objections urged against it; but these objections he did not see fit to notice. Before he can make such an application with the *least show* of plausibility, he must prove that it is a parable. This, I apprehend, he will find no easy task.

My opponent prays that he may be guided into truth. This is *my* prayer also. I now invite him to a careful, a candid and prayerful examination of this portion of God’s word.


Allow me to ask, what evidence he has that the Savior meant to be understood figuratively? By what rule of interpretation, either of scripture or of language in general, does he make this passage figurative? It is *reasonable* he should tell us.

I regard this passage as an application of the two parables which precede it. In the parable of the *ten virgins* reference is had to the coming of Christ to receive his *bride* — the church. Then will it be said, “*the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his bride hath made herself ready.*” In the parable of the *talents* the same scene or event is brought to view again in another form. The return of the master, refers to the coming of

the judge to reckon with his servants. In both of these parables the coming of a particular personage is mentioned at which time there is a gathering and a separation. After closing these parables, he proceeds to make an application of them in plain, literal language, as I believe, — “When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them.” One class he pronounces “*blessed*,” and invites them to a kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; — while the other class are pronounced “*cursed*,” and told to depart into everlasting punishment. All this my opponent says took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, — I say it is a description of a day of general judgment at the end of the world. Now I ask, which looks the most consistent with the language here used? Let the candid answer.

I suppose it will be admitted on all hands, that this passage either refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, or it is a description of a day of general judgment yet future. If I can prove that it cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, and was not fulfilled in that event, it will then be established that Jesus Christ is to make his personal appearance, to gather all the nations of the dead and living, and pass the final sentence, — receiving some to everlasting life, and dooming others to everlasting punishment. And my point will be gained, that the scriptures teach that a part of the human family will suffer endless punishment.

I shall now repeat some of my objections to applying this text to the destruction of Jerusalem, and hope my opponent will condescend to notice them.

1. These events are to take place “*when the Son of Man shall come in his glory*.” I ask, *how* did Jesus Christ come in his *glory* at the destruction of Jerusalem, any more than he did at the fall of  Babylon, or Sodom, or in any other great calamity? Was the “coming” of *Titus* to destroy Jerusalem, the coming of Christ *in his glory*? The apostle Paul speaks of being “*glorified together with Christ*,” but if his glory consis-

ted in the bloody conquests of Rome over the Jewish nation, could it be very desirable, by a pure minded apostle to share in that glory?

2. "All the *holy angels*" are to come at this time. How was this fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem? The *holy* angels cannot mean the Roman armies, for they are nowhere called holy. They were bloody, savage heathen, called by our Savior the "*abomination of desolation*;" hence, they could not be the holy angels spoken of in the text. Again, it is said he shall come with *all* the holy angels; if the Roman soldiers are meant, then all the Roman soldiers must have been at the destruction of Jerusalem which was not the fact. Neither could it mean the ministers of the Gospel, and other Christians, for they did not "*come*" to Jerusalem at that time, but those who were near the city all *fled* before the fearful blow was struck. I ask again, how did Christ come "*with all his holy angels*" at that time?

3. "*All nations*" are to be "*gathered before him*" at that time. Was this fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem? It could not be the Jews, for they were not "*all nations*," but only one nation, neither were they *all* "*gathered*" at that time before the Son of Man, but those who *were* present, were either slain, or carried into captivity. Neither can the Roman armies, though composed of individuals from many nations, be said to be "*all nations*." To assert this, would be giving his opponent a liberty with the word *all*, which might be used to his disadvantage before the close of this discussion.

4. The gathered nations are to be "*separated*" at the coming of the Son of Man mentioned in the text, one part receiving a kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world, and the other portion being driven "*into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels*." How was this fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem? My opponent says, "At that time the wicked Jews, figuratively speaking, went away into everlasting punishment, and the christian believers into life eternal." I would ask if this application is satisfactory to this audience? How did the Jews go into everlasting punishment at that time?

I will tell you. *Hundreds of thousands* of them, by sword, by suicide, by famine, and various other ways, during the siege of the city, and wars in other places, passed through the gates of death, and, according to the theory of my opponent, *went immediately* to the joys of heaven; while the christian believers, who, he says, entered into eternal life at that time, were left on earth, in a condition of great suffering, and more wretched than before the destruction. For more than two hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Romans followed the christians with persecutions unparalleled for severity and cruelty in the history of the church. And this my opponent calls “enjoying the special blessings promised them here”!!! According to this, Paul received the “*crown*” that was laid up for him, to be given in “*that day*,” and not to him only, but to all them that loved Christ’s appearing at the destruction of Jerusalem. It was *then* that those who did not “*fall*” had “an entrance administered unto them abundantly, into the everlasting kingdom,” and the “people of God” entered into “the *rest* that remained for them!” How absurd!

Having now shown *conclusively* that this passage cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, it follows that it must have its fulfilment in the future state. Now, taking the principle laid down by my opponent, that “the true meaning of the word [everlasting] is to be determined by the connection in which it is used, we are prepared to understand the closing verse of the passage under consideration: “Those [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.” As this text has its fulfilment in the future state, everlasting must be taken into its unlimited sense. My point is therefore *proved*.

My fifth and last proof text is 2 Thess. i. 7—9. This he also applies to the destruction of Jerusalem. What a convenient hobby the destruction of that city makes for a great multitude of passages, which, if literally understood, would entirely destroy the whole theory of Universalism. Such is the text under consideration. There is not a word said about this event in plain language in either of the epistles addressed to the

Thessalonians. He cannot furnish the name of a single biblical student of any note who applies this text to that event! But I must notice his attempt to prove his application of this text. He thinks Luke xvii. 30, 31, is to the point. But before he can make this appear, he must prove, 1. That the text in Luke relates to the destruction of Jerusalem, and 2. That the phrase "that day" in both texts, refer to the same period. He next quotes Matt. xvi. 27, 28. The first verse reads, "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and then shall he reward every man according to his works." This text cannot refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, for the reasons that Matt. xxv. 31 — 46, cannot refer to that event, which have been given. Once more, I will here add — Christ did not at that time "reward *every man* according to his works" in any sense. But the next verse he regards as his strong hold. "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of man *coming in his kingdom.*" But did Christ *come in his kingdom* at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans? If so, then his kingdom is "of this world," and then *did* his servants *fight!* which plainly contradicts his own doctrine. (John xviii. 31.) Let my opponent get rid of this conclusion, if he can. Again, my opponent remarked, (extempore) that "this is plain, literal language, and *no parable.* If it is, it cannot certainly refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, for there is nothing of the kind in the text, {unless the coming of the son of man in his kingdom is equivalent to the coming of Titus with the Roman army. The parallel text in Mark reads, "there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God *come with power.*" Turn to Luke xxiv. 49, where, after his resurrection, he tells his apostles, "behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, *until ye be endued with power from on high.*" Now read the 2d chap. of the Acts, and you will find this fulfilled in a wonderful manner. Then the kingdom of God, which had already come, (for Christ said in his day "the kingdom of God *has come upon*

you") came with still greater "*power.*" The declaration of the Savior, "there be some standing here that shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God come with power," was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, in the baptism of the disciples with the Holy Ghost, and the conversion of 3000 who scattered abroad, preaching Christ and the resurrection. How much more this looks like the kingdom of God than the bloody wars of the Jews and Romans !

My opponent "stands prepared to prove that Christ made his second advent at the destruction of Jerusalem." If he will undertake this task, I will spend an additional evening with him on this point.

I now close my arguments on the first part of this question, unless it should be thought best to prolong the discussion on this point.

I consider that it is clearly sustained that Christ and his apostles taught the doctrine of endless punishment.

Arguments have been, and are *now* presented before this audience in support of this doctrine; which bare assertion, and appeals to human sympathies, will be unable to move. "The word of God standeth *sure.*" "*He that believeth, shall be saved; and he that believeth not, shall be damned.*" So saith the "living and true Witness."

DISCUSSION,

PART I. NO. IV.

REJOINDER.

IN THE UNIVERSALIST CHURCH, APRIL 4, 1843.

BY E. FRANCIS.

“Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.”

1 JOHN, IV. 1.

THIS exhortation of the beloved disciple, John, has seemed to me appropriate, as a motto, in replying to the discourse to which you have listened this evening.

It is, and I trust it may ever be, my prayer, that I may be enabled to “try the spirits whether they are of God,” by the true spirit of my master — Jesus Christ.

I cannot but express my regret, that my brother has felt it to be his duty to make use of some language that he has on this occasion. The Prince of Peace, “when he was reviled, reviled not again.” God grant, that his servant now, may thus aim to do!

The introductory remarks of my brother, I need not notice, as they give merely the outline of his former discourse. I proceed directly to the first division of his second discourse in proof of the affirmative of the question; which is indeed, simp-

ly a reply to my rejoinder. Duty requires me to follow, as well as I am able, in the course he has marked out.

I. In the former discourse, my brother asserted that "some few in these latter days," had risen up and taught a sentiment which had never been taught before; this was the *idea*, though not the precise words. That argument — assertion, we should call it, met with an opposite assertion; believing that one *assertion* was as good as another. I also alluded to the brief existence of the denomination to which my brother belongs. To this allusion he replies that I "will not style them new teachers in reference to the doctrine of endless punishment." Certainly not — this sentiment, as I before said, is of heathen origin, and was currently entertained more than 2000 years ago. I alluded to the length of time since *his denomination* had been established, as such, to meet the argument from the brief existence of my own, as a distinctive sect.

My brother "will not style us '*new teachers*,' in reference to the doctrine of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." (Acts iii. 21.) He says, "Universalists admit that many of the early Christian Fathers taught this doctrine" of endless punishment. In reply to this I remark, that I suppose he will allow that the public advocates of our faith, are as well acquainted with what we admit, as one *not* of our denomination; and for myself, I never was aware of this fact before; nay, but the contrary is the truth! If by 'the early Christian Fathers,' is understood those who lived and taught, and wrote during the first two centuries of the christian era, we confess ourselves unable to discover this doctrine of *endless punishment*, as contained in their writings. But suppose that they did teach this, does it prove that the *scriptures* do?

The first christian writer that is known to have asserted the equal duration of happiness and misery, was Tertullian, about the commencement of the *third* century.

My brother has professed to tell us how old Universalism is; and quotes, as he says, from the "Modern History of Universalism," page 318, to show that the beloved "John Murray is

styled the Father of Universalism." He asks, "can the child be older than its parent?"

Though off from the question under discussion, "is the doctrine of endless punishment taught *in the scriptures?*" I must beg leave to notice these statements here.

I wish to quote the whole paragraph alluded to in the history. After noticing the doctrine as it existed before and at the time of Father Murray's arrival in this country, Br. Whittemore says, "These are the traces of Universalism as it existed in the United States previously to, and at the time of Mr. Murray's arrival. But this doctrine can be said to have been then scarcely known; and as his labors were the principal cause of exciting public attention to the subject, and of establishing societies of that faith in different parts of the country, particularly in our populous cities and towns, he is justly considered the FATHER OF UNIVERSALISM IN AMERICA."

I submit it to the candid whether the extract presented by my brother that Murray was "the father of Universalism," without noticing the connection of those four words; particularly the two words that follow them "IN AMERICA," which like them are printed in *capital letters*, is becoming a fair and honest disputant; whose aim is *Truth*. I have the volume with me, which any one may examine who wishes to satisfy himself that I have quoted correctly.

My brother says, that "not a *single doctrine* peculiar to Mr. Murray's creed can be found in the present system of Universalism." Does my brother claim him as a Methodist? He was one in the early part of his life; but then he became converted under the labors of James Rely of London, previous to his arrival in this country in 1770. But what is the distinguishing sentiment of Universalism, now? what was it in the days of Murray? What idea is commonly affixed to the name? Is it not that Universalists believe, and teach "the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?" I need not notice this matter further, nor speak of the unjust, because untrue, declaration, that Universalism "finds its true date in 1818." My master directs to pray for those who despitefully use us: "*Father, forgive them!*"

My brother denies my position that the doctrine of endless punishment is of heathen origin, and calls for proof. I thought I presented a little proof in my former discourse, but he has not deemed it worthy of notice. He says, "The law of God first given to man, I regard as the first announcement of this doctrine." Is it not a little singular that my brother should call upon me to present proof of the origin of his sentiment of endless punishment, which he regards as taught in "The law of God first given to man," without so much as producing *one* testimony from the first written law of God, in proof of the correctness of his opinion? Had he produced one "thus saith the Lord," from the Old Testament, it would have settled the matter at once, and I might well have been defied to produce the contrary. But I will endeavor to sustain *my* position. — "Jahn says, that the Pharisees 'taught that the spirits of the wicked were tormented with everlasting punishments.' (Bib. Archæology.) Prideaux, however, is more distinct than Jahn, in stating this as their opinion. Of the wicked, they believed, that their souls, as soon as separated from the bodies, were transmitted into a state of everlasting wo, there to suffer the *punishment of their sins to all eternity.*' (Vol. 3. p. 46.)

From whence did the Pharisees obtain this doctrine? I answer, that this sect undoubtedly found it among the Jews, when it sprang up among them. But whence did the Jews obtain it? not from the Old Testament; for the Old Testament may be searched from end to end, and in vain, to find such doctrine. What then? Dr. Geo. Campbell shall tell us in his own language.

"But the opinions, says he, neither of the Hebrews nor of the heathens, remained invariably the same. And from the time of the captivity, more especially, from the time of the subjection of the Jews, first to the Macedonian empire, and afterward to the Roman; as they had a closer intercourse with pagans, *they insensibly imbibed many of their sentiments*, particularly on those subjects whereon the law was silent, and wherein, by consequence, they considered themselves as at greater freedom. On this subject of a future state, we find a considerable difference in the popular opinion of the Jews, in

our Savior's time, from those which prevailed in the days of the ancient prophets. As both Greeks and Romans had adopted the notion, that the ghosts of the departed were susceptible, both of enjoyment, and of suffering; they were led to suppose a sort of retribution in that state, for the merit or demerit in the present. The Jews did not indeed adopt the pagan fables on this subject, nor did they express themselves, entirely, in the same manner; *but the general train of thinking in both, came pretty much to coincide.*" (Dis. 6, Part 2, Sec. 19.)

We wish it to be carefully observed, that this testimony of Dr. Campbell, whom I doubt not my brother will acknowledge is some little authority, tells us that the Jews learned opinions of the heathen, on those subjects about which their law preserved silence. "Their law, as we have seen, preserves the most profound silence in regard to *endless misery*; while the heathen did believe, as we have also seen, in *endless misery*. What more probable, then, that the Jews should imbibed the heathen notions on this subject, especially during the Babylonian captivity, in which they came in contact with pagans for seventy years? Indeed, Campbell says, that they were led to suppose a retribution in another world for the sins of this; and that the train of thinking, on this point, both by Jews and pagans, came pretty much to coincide. It was from the pagans, then, that the Jews learned the doctrine of endless misery. And when the Pharisees sprang up, they found this doctrine among the Jews, and they adopted it."*

II. My brother's second division, has reference to the same subject presented in the second position of his first discourse; viz. 1st. That Christ and his apostles, "nowhere in their history ever raised a note of alarm against the doctrine of endless punishment." He speaks of me as having produced a solitary text to meet this assertion of his. Did he ask for more than one? He said so far as he could learn, "they nowhere in their history ever raised a *single* note of alarm." *One* text then was as good as *fifty* to meet his statement.

He seems to think I used craft in that when I quoted from Matt. xvi. 12, I left off the words "and of the Sadducees." He asks, "Why did he stop in his quotation"? &c. I did not

* G. W. Montgomery.

deem it necessary to bring the Sadducees into the argument at all, because they were believers in the doctrine of *annihilation*. “Beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees *and of the Sadducees*,” is what he would have presented. I did not suppose that my brother would have been disposed to assert that the Sadducees were Universalists; because, were he to do thus, he would have contradicted his former declaration, that “some few in *these latter days* had called in question the doctrine of endless punishment;” that they were “new teachers.” He attempts to refute my argument upon his main position, by an alteration in the phraseology of the quotation I made from W. M. Fernald. That quotation was made in consequence of his having quoted a sentence in its connection himself. By leaving out the Pharisees, (he says) “I will prove to you that the Savior warned his disciples against *Universalism*.” Well, then, Universalism is some older, according to his own admission, than John Murray, or Hosea Ballou! But, my friends, the Sadducees were not Universalists. Far from it. They denied the doctrine of the future life altogether; not only future punishment but future happiness also. See Matt. xxii. 23; Mark xii. 18; Luke xx. 27.

This single fact, that Christ and his apostles taught the resurrection, was a death blow to their system; but not to Universalism — not to christianity.

My brother says, “But our Savior tells us *definitely* what this doctrine is against which he warned his disciples.” He quotes from Luke xii. 1, where Christ bids his disciples, “Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, *which is hypocrisy*.” The text that I presented, was from Matt. xvi. 12 — Where Jesus directs the disciples, “Beware of the *doctrine* of the Pharisees *and of the Sadducees*.” I have yet to learn that the *sin of hypocrisy*, was a doctrine publicly believed in and advocated either by the *Pharisees* or *Sadducees*. The master warned his disciples of the *doctrine* of the Pharisees, which represented that *only those they called the saints* would enjoy future and endless bliss, while those they called the sinners, would be doomed to endless punishment; and, also the *doctrine* of the *Sadducees*, which denied the doctrine of the resurrection, taught by Jesus,

and which Universalists in these days teach. I am not aware that the belief in the existence of God *was not* cherished by others beside the Pharisees in those days.

2. My brother notices the passage in 1 Timothy iv. 10, which I presented as proof that the apostles were opposed for believing and preaching a doctrine opposite to endless punishment. He says of me, "this is the only text that he produced in answer to my call." Well, my friends, the call was made for but one instance in the whole New Testament — *only one*. Surely he should be satisfied if I presented one. The impression designed to be made by the text, was simply of the fact taught in it. "*Therefore we both labor and suffer reproach, [why?] because we trust in the living God who is the Savior of all men.*" But my brother says that the reason they "suffered reproach, was because they trusted in the *living God* in opposition to the idol gods of the heathen." But was this letter of Paul written to a heathen convert? Nay, it was written to one, who from childhood was educated in the Jewish religion, which surely taught the existence of the one living and true God; it was written to his son in the gospel ministry — Timothy. The gospel taught something more than the Pharisees' and Sadducees' creed, concerning the Great Jehovah. It not only taught that he was the living God, but that he was "*the Savior of all men.*" Will my brother attempt to maintain the position that the apostles met with opposition, or suffered reproach *only* from the *heathen* nations? that the Jews, the Pharisees and Sadducees never opposed the christians? It is very evident that there was some other cause, why Paul and Timothy, and the rest of the christian band suffered reproach, and this is distinctly declared in the passage presented, "*because they trusted in the living God who is the Savior of all men.*" My brother says God is the Savior of all men, inasmuch as he has provided salvation for *all*, and invited all to come and be saved." Well, allow this; the all-wise God would not be so unwise as to make provision for the salvation of all, when he knew that only a part would come and be saved. But the idea he evidently designed to convey, was this — God had made the provision, yet all would not come; nevertheless he is the Sav-

ior of those who do not come! I confess myself unable to comprehend this.

Were you on board a vessel, when some unfortunate sailor had fallen into the ocean, and witnessed the exertions of the crew to rescue him from a watery grave, which proved abortive; would you call that crew the saviors of the sailor? They indeed made all the offers—they used every means in their power to save him; but they were unsuccessful.

I cannot believe our Heavenly Father *is the Savior of all men*, unless he has made such provision *for all, as will save all*.

The latter clause of the text, my brother deems important, “especially of those that believe.” I appeal to every christian believer present, whether he or she does not feel that he or she enjoys a special salvation in believing? This testimony in the text does in no way invalidate the preceding portion of it. I will present two passages that will make the subject plain. Paul says, 2 Timothy iv. 11. “The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments.” Will any say that Paul did not wish the cloak and the books, because he spoke *especially* of the parchments? Again, David says, Ps. xxxi. 11. “I was a reproach among all mine enemies, but *especially* among my neighbors.” Would any assert that David was not a reproach among his enemies from this? By no means. We argue then that not only is God the special Savior of the believer here, but he is also the Savior of all men, and that it was for preaching that he is such, that Christ and his apostles suffered reproach. My brother calls for a “*single text*” that declares this fact, and says, “*This [I] cannot produce!*” I appeal to the honest and candid hearer whether I have done this, and whether one testimony has been presented where Christ or his apostles ever preached against the sentiment of endless punishment. Jesus warned his disciples against the endless punishment doctrine of the Pharisees, and the annihilation doctrine of the Sadducees! As did Christ so would we say unto you, Beware of the *doctrine*, yes, and also, Beware of the *hypocrisy* of the Pharisees. They believed “in the doctrine of endless punishment

for a part or portion of the human family." Not for themselves, to be sure, but for those *they* called *sinners*. Again, we say, beware of this partial, endless wo doctrine of the Pharisees, and annihilation doctrine of the Sadducees.

III. We pass now to an examination of the third and main division of the discourse. This is based upon the following inquiry, which is the same as presented in the former discourse. "*Did Christ and his apostles use such language in their discourses and writings as was used by believers in endless punishment in reference to this subject?*" The idea, if I understand it, is this. If Christ and his apostles ever used such language as the believers in endless punishment were accustomed to use as descriptive of their doctrine, either in parable or otherwise, why then, they of course believed with those who taught such doctrine. But we deem this conclusion illegitimate.

Our reasons are, that were we to allow this to be truth, we should in applying this same principle of interpretation, make the Savior a believer in many foolish notions entertained among the people of those days. For instance, it is well known that the Jews believed in the doctrine of *demonology*; that people were actually taken possession of by wicked, invisible spirits; that the spirits of deceased wicked men were permitted to return to the earth and torment mankind. Now it is allowed by the enlightened of all sects, indeed they unite, in rejecting the belief of these heathen demons as absurd in the extreme. And yet it is said repeatedly in the New Testament, that the Savior cast out devils. On a certain occasion the Pharisees accused Christ of casting out devils, or demons, by the power of the idol "Beelzebub, the prince of devils." In reply, Jesus exclaimed, "If I, by Beelzebub, cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" Here Jesus did not correct their heathen notions on this subject and instruct them that this God was but a senseless idol, but he allowed them to remain still in their belief of Beelzebub as the prince of devils.

If he had thought it important to correct this error, particularly, he doubtless would have done it. But because he used this language common among them, it is no more right for us to say that he believed in and taught the possession of devils,

as a truth, than it would be for us to say that our Physicians believe that certain imaginary saints have taken up their abode in those persons who are afflicted with the St. Anthony's Fire — or St. Vitus' Dance, &c.

These are simply diseases of the body, and are not caused by the power of some imaginary Saint.

“Jesus evidently did not deem it necessary or important to undertake to correct all the erroneous and absurd notions of that age. The Jews were exceedingly superstitious and bigoted. They entertained a vast variety of dogmas of the most unreasonable and foolish description. Had Christ turned his attention to these minor errors, and endeavored to banish from the minds of the people all the absurdities they cherished, it would have occupied his whole time and attention. Jesus, rather than spend his time upon the multitude of these *lesser* errors, deemed it more important to correct the *greater* errors which the Jews entertained in regard to the character of God, and the principles by which he is governed in his dealings with the world, and to devote his whole energy to the establishment of his gospel among men, knowing that wherever that gospel prevailed it would unavoidably sweep away this doctrine of demons and all false notions.”

This subject we have introduced, merely to illustrate the idea we intended to convey, when we said, in our former rejoinder, that Jesus sometimes in his instructions made his language “to conform to the religious prejudices and superstitions of the Israelites, yet without endorsing their superstitions as truth.”

This my brother is unwilling to admit, because as he thinks on this principle it will be impossible to prove that there is such a place or state as Heaven. Very well, I do not wish to reply to this objection, as I do not rely upon heathenish testimony in proof “of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind.”

My brother quotes again from Josephus, and speaks of my admitting *all* he contended for, which he shows is not the case, in that he immediately proceeds to make a long quotation from Dr. Fisk, the substance of which is “that Christ and his apostles used the same language employed by the Jews in reference to endless punishment, and that without the least intimation that

they held a contrary doctrine. Whether Christ and his apostles taught a doctrine contrary to endless punishment, viz. the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, is a point that comes under the latter head of the question under discussion, and which will be noticed when we come to search the Word in its support.

Allow that Jesus used the same phraseology that the Jews did when speaking of endless punishment; it still remains to be shown that Jesus applied this language to the future, endless condition of all the wicked, — *as* the Jews did. The challenge of my brother to me to produce “a single term or phrase employed by the Jews to express endless punishment, *stronger* than those used by Jesus Christ and his apostles;” appears to me to be off from the question under discussion, and may with propriety be met with a challenge for him to produce language used by Christ and his apostles, stronger than that used by Jews or heathen. For surely if they taught this doctrine of endless punishment which is deemed the pillar of morality by many, they would have presented it in plain, distinct terms, so that there need be no question about it. But I make not the challenge, as were there such a case, my brother would have presented it as one of his proof texts. We will here ask a question which has often presented itself to our mind. If Christ and his apostles taught this blessed, nay, horrid sentiment of endless misery, so congenial to the opinions and feelings of the Jews and heathen generally, why did they persecute him so bitterly?

Was it for preaching this doctrine of partialism — endless and unmitigated woe — that the pure, the humble, the sinless, the kind, and benevolent Jesus was crucified? No, no! The bosom of the “beloved Son,” contained too much of the milk of human kindness, too much of love, too much of pity and compassion; it felt too much of the spirit of the first and second commandments — love to God and love to man — on which hang all the law and the prophets, to teach the doctrine of God’s endless love to a part, and God’s endless hatred to the remaining part of the human family.

I. My brother accuses me of having made an “unwarrantable assumption that three of his proof texts were parables; which he says I “made no attempt to, and cannot prove.” It will be remembered by the hearer, I presume, that I gave an explanation of what was considered a parable. I did not suppose my brother would deny those texts were parables; it is the opinion of the most intelligent and respectable commentators, ancient as well as modern, and of all denominations, that the narration of the *Rich Man and Lazarus*, is not a *literal* history but a *parable*. I may mention the names of Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Whitby, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Gill, the ancient and learned Theophylact, Dr. Proudfit, Archbishop Tillotson, &c. all but one, I believe, were believers in the doctrine of endless punishment. Dr. Lightfoot speaks of it as credulity and ignorance, to suppose this a *literal* history; and in addition remarks as follows — “That it was a *parable* not only the consent of *all expositors* may assure us, but the *thing itself* speaks it.

My brother’s quotation from Dr. Clarke need not be noticed, as it proves not that the account is *real history*. Three objections are urged against calling this passage in Luke xvi. 22—26, a parable.

1. He says, “it is not introduced as such.” It begins “*There was*, &c.” The eloquent and celebrated French divine, Saurin, says, “certain critics affirm, some ancient manuscripts introduce the passage with these words, “Jesus spake a parable, saying, *There was a certain rich man*,” &c. Archbishop Tillotson agrees with this. But receive the record just as it is now, this objection of my brother’s is of no weight at all, since it could be applied with the same propriety to the parable of the good Samaritan, (which begins — “A certain man went down from Jerusalem,”) and the prodigal son, and many others that are recorded without any distinct *declaration* that they are parables.

2. My brother says, “there is no feature of this account that is *necessarily* figurative.” I should like to know if this is the fact, *how large the bosom of Abraham* might be, if Lazarus was literally carried into it by angels.

3. He says, “It is unlike all other parables,” which were

“designed to illustrate high and important truths. If this be a parable, it is a fictitious narration of something — no one knows what.” I reply, that as this narration, from what we have already said, must evidently be a parable; and as it was spoken by our Lord, it must have been designed to illustrate some truth. The remark that, “if it be a parable, it is a fictitious narration of something — no one knows what,” I presume to be an acknowledgement that if I can prove it to *be* a parable, it no longer is an argument, or proof text, in support of the doctrine of endless punishment.

I will offer one or two more reasons why this must be a parable.

If received literally, it would teach that a certain man was *lost*, simply because he was *rich*, and another *saved* because he was *poor*. The passage does not say that the rich man was vicious and wicked. The only thing that is alleged against him is, that he was rich; that he was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day. Now if the *rich* in this world are to be lost forever, I tremble for some members of my brother's denomination. Dr. Clarke says of the rich man, “In comparison of thousands, he was not only blameless, but he was a virtuous man.”

Again, there is nothing in the record to show that the moral character of the beggar was any better than that of the rich man. Another objection to receiving the passage as a real history is, that it would compel us to believe that when the beggar died, he actually and literally went into the bosom of Abraham. How absurd the idea. We cannot say that *this* is figurative, unless it be allowed that the whole account is figurative. It would violate all rules of language to say, a part of the transactions were figurative, and another part literal.

Another objection to giving a literal construction to the passage is, that it would teach that heaven and hell are so near, that the inhabitants can see and converse with each other. Can any who possess the least sensibility, desire to go to heaven, if they must there look upon their father or mother, their brothers or sisters, or some of their dear friends, and countless multitudes of their fellow beings, writhing in flames of fire, and

hear them shrieking in agony, and calling for water to cool their tongues? What kind of hearts, I would like to be informed, must those possess who can wish to enter such a heaven? Again, must not these sights be seen, and these sounds be heard, by those who are in heaven, if the account of the Rich man and Lazarus is a *literal* history? But enough; we think that reasons sufficient have already been presented to satisfy our hearers, that the passage under consideration is a *parable*. Was it then *candid* in me when I before declared that it was a parable?

My brother asks, What great truth is even alluded to if the passage is not understood literally? He calls for proof that Christ applied it to something in this state of existence. If I have shown that his application cannot be correct, it is sufficient so far as the argument is concerned. It is not my duty to give the true application, since I do not rely upon the passage in support of my side of the question; and again, the time allotted me, does not admit of a thorough examination of the parable. Suffice it that we state in outline, that we consider the rich man the parabolic representative of the unbelieving Jewish people; that Lazarus is the parabolic representative of the publicans and sinners, whether of Jewish or Gentile extraction; that by Abraham's bosom, is symbolized the gospel kingdom; and that Hades is symbolically used, as in other parts of the Bible, to represent the miseries and torments experienced by those of whom the rich man is a parabolic representative. Jesus evidently designed by this allegory to represent the casting away of the Jews in consequence of their blind and obstinate unbelief, and the entrance of the Gentiles into the gospel kingdom of Jesus Christ.*

II. My brother's second proof text is Luke xii. 4, 5: where Jesus said to his disciples, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that, have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; Fear him, which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell; (Gehenna,) yea,

* Agreeably to the notice given I lectured on the parable the following Sunday evening.

I say unto you fear him." The simple idea of this passage to my mind, as I gave before, is that Jesus would have his disciplesⁿ fear God, and not men. God who had infinite power, and therefore could inflict upon them something more grievous than men could do. Human tribunals could deprive them of physical life, but they could do *no more*. I *did not* assert that by Gehenna in the passage, was to be understood the calamities which should befall the Jews, as my brother would represent me as having done. The question upon the text is, "does it teach the doctrine of endless punishment for any part or portion of the human family?" The whole argument, therefore, is based upon the word Gehenna—here translated hell. Does this word signify endless punishment? I answer it does not, and further, that the word was not used by the Jews in such a sense, *before or at* the time of the Savior. But, allowing that it does here mean endless punishment, for the sake of the argument, which we contend it does not, there is no proof from the *text* itself, that *God will* cast any into endless woe! It proves nothing further than that God "*hath power*," not that *he will*. You will get my idea more clearly from the words of Jesus, Matt. iii. 9; where he says, "God is *able* of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." God was *able*, he had *the power* to perform the act, but that was no proof that he would do it. Again, Matt. xxvi. 53, Jesus says, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently send me more than twelve legions of angels." Although God was *able*—*had the power*—to send these angels, yet he did not do it.

My brother represents me as saving my criticisms on Gehenna for certain reasons, until I came to notice his third proof text. Now be it known to you all, that my reason for not saying more upon this text before, was the very good reason that my brother presented this text and the parable of the 'Offending Hand' *together*; that he said nothing in the way of comment upon the text itself. I thank him for reminding me of the mistake I made, in saying that the two words from which *Gehenna* is derived—*Gee* and *Hinnom* were *Greek* words, they are indeed *Hebrew*—and it can nowhere be shown

that these words in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, have the least allusion to the doctrine of endless punishment. My brother well knows that this was a mistake of carelessness, from the remarks I made upon the word under the first division of my former discourse. This is excusable. But the presenting of two passages, where the word *Gehenna* occurs, and then commenting upon them as though the original word was *Hades*, is quite another thing. I am glad my brother has discovered his error, and is willing to allow that *Gehenna* is not a word which could *ever* be translated *grave*. I pass now to his third text.

III. Mark ix. 43, 44. The parable of the Offending Hand. I need not notice his question, in which he represents me as trifling with the word of God. Perhaps his views and mine may be different upon this matter. It appears that I was in error in supposing the extracts which he presented from Josephus, in his remarks upon this passage, should have reference to the place of endless punishment, which he calls hell; it was in reference to the phrases *undying worm* and *unquenchable fire*, that he quoted it. Well, I did not divine that this was his object, since he gave two reasons why *the grave* could not be signified in the passage; and quoted from Josephus' discourse on *Hades*, which surely was something quite different from *Gehenna* in the passage. Again, I did suppose that the phrases, *undying worm* and *unquenchable fire*, were not literal, but figurative expressions, and if so, they should be interpreted with reference to the subject to which they were applied. If they were applied to endless punishment, then we should understand them differently from what we should if they were applied to something that should take place in this world. My brother asked in his former discourse, — having quoted from Josephus, where he introduces terms as applied to the heathen *Hades* — not to the Jewish *Gehenna*; “With what propriety or consistency Christ employed their own phraseology, if he did not allow the doctrine?” What doctrine? The undying worm and the unquenchable fire? No, surely not, these were only appendages of the supposed place of endless misery.

By the doctrine he evidently meant that which he wishes to sustain, namely — endless punishment. Well, does the passage prove this woe will befall any part or portion of the human family? I think not. And I cannot perceive that my brother has introduced any proof to show that the Jews used the term *Gehenna*, to designate a place of endless punishment; and that therefore the disciples of the master understood him as speaking of that when he delivered the parable of the Offending Hand! To be sure my brother says, “I am prepared to prove that Gehenna had come into common use *before* our Saviour’s advent, to express endless punishment, and they (the Jews) must have understood him as using it in the same sense.” But I cannot discover that he has presented such proof; I should rather have had *the thing* itself, than the assertion. For my own part I confess myself ignorant of any thing that can be considered *unquestionable authority* upon this point. I presume if my brother had had this, he would have presented it and thus have set the matter at rest upon the point, that the Jews used the word *Gehenna*, as descriptive of a state of future *endless punishment*.

I spoke of the true idea set forth by this parable in my former discourse. I therefore need not do it now. That the passage with the two that follow it, should be understood figuratively, as parables, and not in a literal sense, is clear, because if taken literally it would be attributing to Jesus the doctrine, that some will enter upon the spiritual existence of another life, deprived of a hand, a foot, or an eye — than which nothing could be more unscriptural or absurd. The remarks that my brother makes upon my closing paragraph consist mainly of questions which deny nothing I asserted, and which it is not my duty to answer; I have not the affirmative of the question, but the negative. Besides there *appears* to be, and I believe I am not mistaken, something like one Matthew Hale Smith about them, from whose lectures I presume my brother has gathered much material. If he knew him as well as some, he would be cautious how he made much use of that unfortunate individual’s libellous production.

IV. His fourth passage is Matt. xxv. 31 — 46. The parable of

the Sheep and Goats. I marvel much that my brother should deny that the passage is a parable. But this he does, and says, that before I can make the application which I did with the *least show* of plausibility, I must prove that it is a parable.

He professes to give my reasons for calling it such, but he does not go far enough. He acknowledges that the preceding portion of the chapter consists of two parables. The latter, the parable of the Ten Talents, is known to be such, because the record says, "For the kingdom of heaven *is as a man* travelling into a far country." Now the passage we are to notice says, that "When the Son of Man shall come, &c. — he shall separate them (all nations) one from another *as a Shepherd* divideth his sheep from the goats;" with this my brother stops in his quotation. He acknowledges the latter clause of the 32d verse to be figurative, but the rest of the passage he tells us is to be understood as *literal* and not parabolical. The 32d verse is as follows, "And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left." Is this to be understood literally? Yes, that is the amount of my brother's argument. Very well then, the passage answers not the purpose for which it is produced, for if it is to be received in a literal sense, it is far from proving the endless punishment of *man*. And these, who? why these on the left hand, these goats, not wicked men to be sure, for the passage does not contain the words; to be sure the words, the cursed, occur; but who are the cursed? the goats of course, for be it observed this account is not a parable but a literal fact, according to my brother's argument. "And these (goats) shall go away into everlasting punishment." And what is the everlasting punishment? Why the everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. Everlasting fire? yes, a literal fire, it matters not what may be the materials that keep the fire alive, it is an *everlasting fire prepared, designed for the devil and his angels*, but then the *goats* are to go into it; there is no excuse for them, never mind if *they* are *not* the devil's angels, the decree has gone forth, Depart! and *these shall* go into everlasting punishment.

Do you my friends call this trifling with the language of Je-

sus? It is. And whose argument is it that does this? Is it his who claims the passage to be a *literal* truth, or is it his who asks only that the language may be received as the Great Teacher uttered it, and designed that it should be; figuratively, to illustrate an important truth? I submit it to the candid hearer whether the passage is a parable or otherwise.

I have presented this matter in the light I have, that my brother may see that bold assertion and ridicule is two edged, it may be used by each, but it is not the true weapon for either. Let then the aim be to present convincing argument, and plain, reasonable, scripture proof in support of affirmative declarations.

My brother endeavors to overthrow my position that the passage has special reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the overthrow of the Jewish nation. But his objections are based wholly upon the fact that it is to be understood literally, and not as a parable. He further thinks that if he can show that the Jewish overthrow is not alluded to, that it will be admitted on all hands that this passage "is descriptive of a day of general judgment yet future."

For one I should not be willing to admit the position. I should then call for proof allowing that there is to be *such a day of judgment*, as my brother speaks of, which by the way I do *not* find taught in the Holy Bible. — I say, allowing that there is to be such a day, I must still call for proof that a portion of the human family will be sentenced to endless punishment.

I need not condescend to notice his objections, since I have shown that the foundation upon which they are based is not literal but parabolical language. Where are his arguments in support of his sentiment drawn from the passage? I have seen none other; then if it does not refer to the Jewish overthrow, it must refer to another world. This I do not admit. The careful reader of the New Testament will remember that the division into chapters and verses is an invention of comparatively recent origin; he will therefore, in commencing a chapter, be careful to observe whether the subject is continued from the previous chapter or not. Now the chapter in which the para-

ble of the Sheep and Goats is recorded, begins with the words *Then shall, &c.* When? look back through the 24th chapter, and you will have your answer. Now I believe that it is universally allowed that the first part of this chapter has reference to the time of the Jewish overthrow, and I have never been able to discover where Jesus left *that subject* and proceeded to speak of another and very different one. As therefore the former part of the Savior's discourse, speaks of the Jerusalem destruction, so does the whole, unless it can be distinctly shown that Jesus did change, and where he changed his theme. As the parable under notice is recorded in this discourse, it has reference to the same general subject spoken of here. The *time* to which the parable refers depends upon the meaning of the word *then* at the commencement of the 25th chapter. To learn this, as I before said, we must examine the 24th chapter. I will read the 14th to the 21st verses. * * * * Now the question is, what is spoken of here? Every one will allow that it is the Jewish overthrow. The time then is fixed, to which this parable refers; and as it has allusion to something that took place *in this world*, it cannot teach the doctrine of endless punishment, for any part or portion of the human family.

V. My brother's fifth and last proof text is 2 Thessalonians i. 7 — 9. The amount of his argument upon this passage, is, that the Jewish overthrow is not plainly alluded to, in the epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians. He also says of me, "He cannot furnish the name of a *single biblical* student of any note who applies this text to that event." In reply I ask, whether such men as Dr. Hammond, Newcome Cappe and Dr. Gill, were men of mean obscurity? I assert without the fear of contradiction that such individuals as these stand high in the theological world as biblical students of some note. Perhaps as high as my brother himself would like to stand. They answer his assertion. Let it be observed that my brother has not replied to my arguments on the passage, neither has he presented an iota of proof this evening to show that it must have reference to another state of existence. He has noticed, indeed

certain texts which I presented to show the *time* alluded to by Paul. But he has not shown that they necessarily have reference to the future world. I wish to quote here again Luke xvii. 30, 31; Matt. xxiv. 15—18; Matt. xxiii. 36; Luke xxi. 20—23; Matt. x. 23; xvi. 27, 28; xxiv. 29, 30.* Now from these passages we learn that directions were to be observed in *THAT DAY*, when the Son of man should be revealed, when the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel should be witnessed, when Jerusalem should be compassed with armies; and Jesus testifies that all these things should come upon that generation, yea the disciples should not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come, that then the tribes of the earth should see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and that there were some standing before him who should not taste death, till they beheld the Son of man coming in his kingdom. What shall we say of the individual who presumes to dispute this plain testimony? May I not with justness retort the language deemed appropriate to me? Let him who calls in question the words of the great master, go and settle the matter with Jesus. For my part I prefer to receive the teachings of my Savior, as of more weight than the attempts to ‘explain away,’ made by persons in these days.

In conclusion, I remark, that I have thus briefly, endeavored again to meet, what my brother has presented as proof of the affirmative of the question. He presented in his first discourse five passages from the New Testament; these he has reiterated in his second, and whether I have shown that these, which are his *strongest*, if not all of his proof texts, do not teach the horrid sentiment of endless punishment, or otherwise, is left to the candid judgment of our hearers.

One word upon the passage quoted as the conclusion of his discourse. Mark xvi. 16. “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.” I need not ask from what those should be saved who believed?

* The reader will please turn to the passages.

In what we have this evening advanced, it is evident that it was not endless punishment in another world. If you will read the verses that follow the passage, you will find something like this — “ And these signs shall follow them that believe : In my name shall they cast out devils ; they shall speak with new tongues ; they shall take up serpents ; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them ; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” Does my brother profess to *believe* ? Can he do these things ? Then let him be cautious how he quotes language on which he intends a peculiar construction shall be put.

I leave the subject with the prayer that the time may soon come when the heathen sentiment of Partialism, “ The doctrine that a part or portion of the human family shall be doomed to suffer endless punishment, in another state of being,” may be eradicated from the minds and hearts of men, as thoroughly as it is from that Book of books, the Holy Scriptures, and that in its place the light of divine truth, and the spirit of love may pervade the whole intelligent creation.—Amen.

DISCUSSION,

PART II. No. I.

IN THE METHODIST CHURCH, APRIL 11, 1843.

BY E. FRANCIS.

“Is the doctrine of endless punishment for any part or portion of the human family taught in the Scriptures; or, is the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?”

WHAT SAITH THE SCRIPTURE?

TEXT—ROM. IV. 3.

THE subject of discussion this evening is the latter part of the conjoint question we have just read. The language I have selected for my text, seemed to me peculiarly fitting, as it is my duty and pleasure to speak in behalf of the position that the Scriptures “teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind.”

I acknowledge that the situation I have occupied on the other evenings of the discussion, was not very pleasing to my feelings; in that it was my duty to combat error, and show the absurdity of certain arguments relied upon as proof of the sentiment of endless punishment for a part or portion of the human family, without being permitted to present direct proofs of the opposite sentiment. At this time a more agreeable task is mine. “To the law and to the testimony,” our subject di-

rects us. Do the *Scriptures* teach the universal and impartial love of God as manifested in ultimately redeeming the whole human family *from* all sinfulness and misery, and making them finally *holy* and happy?

As my time is very brief, and I am wholly confined to the *Scriptures*, you will perceive that I am obliged to omit the thousand arguments I might derive from reason, from the workings of God's spirit on the renewed heart, and from God's teachings in nature. Even many of the abundant proofs furnished by the Holy *Scriptures*, I must wholly omit for the want of time.

I. It has been sometimes said that Universalists derive the most of their scripture arguments from the *Old Testament*; I will, therefore, produce but little of its testimony to the doctrine of "the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," Acts iii. 21. From the *Old Testament*, then, I now produce only the promises made to the Ancient Patriarchs. In Genesis xxii. 18, we find it recorded, as the language of the Lord to Abraham, "In thy seed shall *all the nations of the earth* be blessed." This declaration was renewed unto Isaac (xxvi. 4;) and the same promise was confirmed unto Jacob in Genesis xxviii. 14; it is written thus — "In thy seed shall *all the families of the earth* be blessed. These promises are also spoken of by Peter (Acts iii. 25,) on this wise: "And in thy seed shall *all the kindreds of the earth* be blessed." From this testimony we learn, that the eventual blessedness in Christ of all the nations, families and kindreds of the earth, is guarantied by the promise of the Almighty, who, "is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent. Hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath spoken, and shall he not make it good?" (Numbers xxiii. 19.) Moreover, "When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself. . . . For men verily swear by the greater; and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by *two immutable things*, in which it was

impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us," (Hebrews vi. 13 — 18.) That the language of the promise conveys the idea of *universality* cannot be successfully disputed, inasmuch as no individual can be found who belongs not to some nation, family, or kindred. And, indeed, Partialists themselves are constrained to admit the universality of this language. On Gen. xxviii. 14, Dr. Clarke remarks, "Not only all *thy race*, but all the other *families* or *tribes* of mankind, which have not proceeded from the Abrahamic family, *shall be blessed*; for *Jesus Christ by the grace of God tasted death FOR EVERY MAN.*" And on Gen. xii. 3, he remarks, "In the *Messiah* shall all the families of the earth be blessed; for he shall taste death for every man; his gospel shall be preached throughout the world; and *innumerable blessings be derived on ALL MANKIND*, through his *death* and *intercession.*" But an objection is sometimes urged here, that these promises which are thus universal, are not gospel promises, but only promises of temporal blessings. The apostle refutes this objection; he calls them *gospel* promises. Paul, in Gal. iii. alluding to them says, "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the *gospel* unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed." And he adds — "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as for one, and to thy seed, *which is Christ.*" Again, we would ask, is Jesus only an *earthly* prince and merely a *temporal* Savior? No — his is a *heavenly* dominion, and his is a *spiritual* salvation, and such, also, must be the blessing. It was said of him, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people *from their sins.* Matt. i. 21. In accordance with this text, Peter, in speaking of the gospel preached to Abraham, says, in Acts iii. 26, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." *How* were they to be blessed? — with temporal blessings, only? No — hear the testimony — "Unto you, first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in

turning away EVERY ONE of you FROM HIS INIQUITIES" — i. e. in saving EVERY INDIVIDUAL "FROM HIS SINS."

This testimony that we have presented, fully meets the objection that these promises made to the Patriarchs were promises of *temporal* blessings only. They were indeed *spiritual*, and as the apostle testifies, *Gospel* promises, and also promises of justification through faith.

But again, it is objected that admitting they are gospel promises, nevertheless they are conditional; that the blessing indicated in the promise was to be enjoyed *through faith*, and that as faith is not exercised by all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth, so the prospect of universal blessedness in Christ is a mere illusion.

1st. We answer that there is nothing in the promises *themselves* that is conditional.* The language is positive and absolute. The Lord says, In thy seed *shall* all be blessed. We further answer, these promises are either unconditional, or else God's veracity is impeached. To say that *faith* is any part of the condition is the veriest absurdity. For the *promise* is the very thing to be believed. As such, it must be absolutely true before we believe it, else we are required to believe a falsehood, or something which is not true till we believe it. If it be *false*, no one can justly be required to believe it; and if it be true, its verity cannot be affected either by the faith or the disbelief of man. The argument then which we are noticing virtually involves the absurdity, that faith creates the *object* of faith — in other words, that the promise which we are required to believe is not true until we believe it! The promise then, we say, is *absolute*, and by it the doctrine of universal salvation is clearly established. It may perhaps be denied that the promise is the thing to be believed; we remark then, (1.) That with equal propriety one might deny that *the gospel* is the thing to be believed — for when God made promises to Abraham, he preached *the gospel*, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed, Gal. iii. 8. (2.) The *gospel* was thus preached, that the heathen might

* Many of the ideas found in this discourse, were obtained from A. C. Thomas, W. M. Fernald, and A. B. Grosh.

be justified *through faith*. Faith in what? Certainly in the doctrine preached. Will it then be contended, that any man can be justified by faith in that which is not true before it is believed?

2d. It is written, “they which *be* of faith *are* blessed with faithful Abraham,” Gal. iii. 9. We inquire then, How was Abraham “blessed? Plainly in believing that in his seed all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth should be blessed. *His* blessedness was consequent of faith in universal blessedness — and the presupposition is, that the fulfilment of the promise was not, in any sense, dependent upon the exercise of faith *by him*. And as they who believe the same gospel *are* blessed in like manner, it follows that the alleged conditionality of the promise is based in error. Jesus said “Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad,” John viii. 56. He saw it by faith; and the righteousness of his faith was predicated of the *absolute* character of the promise which announced the coming of the Savior.

In 1. John v. 9 — 11, we read thus: “If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he has testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.” Be it observed, that in this passage, believers and unbelievers are called upon to believe the record that God gave of his Son.

Now it is the province of a witness to make that known which is already true, and by disbelieving his testimony we impeach his veracity. What is the record? “*This is the record*, that God hath given to us eternal life.” And “he that believeth not” this record “hath made God a liar.” But how can this be, if the unbeliever hath not this life made sure for him before he believes? The very fact that unbelievers are required to believe that they have eternal life, proves that they have it infallibly in store for them, whether they believe it or not; because, if they thus have it, and yet disbelieve it, they make God a liar, (that is, they impeach the Divine veracity;) but, if they

do not have it we cannot see how they could make him a liar if they *did* disbelieve it, for they would disbelieve no truth. It is precisely so with the promises. We are called upon to believe them. They must, therefore, be true before we believe, and faith cannot be the condition. I am willing to grant that, without faith, we cannot *enjoy* the promises; but this does not prove that they are false, or not true till we believe them. They ARE true, and our disbelief cannot effect thier verity. And they which believe “are blessed with faithful Abraham.” But “what if some did not believe? Shall their unbelief make the faith [rather faithfulness] of God without effect? God forbid: yea, let God be true, but every man a liar.” (Rom. iii. 3, 4.)

We feel no disposition to deny that conditions are appended to many Divine testimonies — such, for instance, as this in Isaiah i. 19, 20: “If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured of the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.” I further hold, that while the promise of universal blessedness in Christ is *absolute*, our present happiness is, in a great measure, dependant on the hearty acknowledgment of the truth. Nevertheless, should every soul of our race live and die in total ignorance of the promise in question, the ultimate purpose of the Almighty would not be defeated thereby. And I am satisfied that this statement is fully sustained by the arguments already presented.

But, again, the apostle hath distinctly declared, in so many words, that the divine promises are not conditional. “But as God is true, our word towards you was not yea and nay. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, even by me, and Sylvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in him was yea. For *all the promises of God in him are yea*, and in *him Amen*, unto the glory of God by us.”

Now then it appears to us that the doctrine of conditions to be performed by the creature, contradicts the spirit of this Sacred Scripture. It affirms that the divine promises, *if believed*, will be yea; and if *disbelieved*, will be nay. And, therefore, instead of the apostle’s doctrine, that they are all yea and amen, it contends that they are *both yea and nay*, according to

the belief or unbelief of men. And, in fact, this system goes still further. It approaches the *deistical* ground, that God's promises are neither one thing nor the other, neither yea nor nay, *until* they are believed or disbelieved by man!!

The language of the Almighty to Abraham, is absolute and unequivocal. No conditions are expressed — no conditions are implied. "In thee and in thy seed *shall* all the nations, families, and kindreds of the earth be blessed." The thing promised is clearly expressed; and it is beyond questioning that the Lord God had at his disposal all the means which are essential to the fulfilment of his purpose. I am "fully persuaded that what he has promised he is able also to perform;" and consequently, I "stagger not at the promise of God through unbelief," but am "strong in faith, giving glory to God." Sin indeed, abounds — but grace or power abounds much more than sin, Rom. v. 20. Unbelief prevails — nevertheless "he is faithful who promised," Heb. x. 23. Men are in bondage — but, "the creation itself also *shall be delivered* from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God," Rom. viii. 21.

So much then for the affirmed conditionality of the promises. Indeed, we are willing to acknowledge that man is not a *passive* instrument in the hands of God; that God's promises will not be fulfilled upon his head with man in a posture of unwillingness or ignorance; that a certain condition of the mind is requisite for the experiencing of God's salvation; — but if *this* be called a conditional salvation, it is a condition that is sure of a true performance; for God, after all, is the ultimate and directing cause, and in this sense it may be said that "we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

II. We pass now from the Old Testament to the new. We have endeavored to present clearly to the minds of our hearers, what we believe to be the truth, concerning the precious promises made to the patriarchal fathers. We will now present testimony from the New Testament that we conceive to be in perfect accordance with the promises. Our testimony is in proof of the doctrine, that the ultimate universal holiness and happiness of the race, *is the will of God*.

That the all-wise, and all-powerful Being, who created and sustains all beings, must have had some design, some will in the creation of mankind, no one will deny. The only difficulty which *can* arise, is in determining *what* that will is. What then, is God's will respecting us? In 1 Timothy ii. 3, 4, we read as follows: "For this [i. e., supplications, prayers, &c. for all men] is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

It is a settled rule, that the word *all* is to be taken in its most unlimited sense, unless an express limitation is named, or the nature of the subject requires a limitation. By examining the context, it will be seen, that so far from limiting its meaning, the apostle expressly guards against it, by specially including even the Pagan rulers, who then were persecutors of the church — and by connecting it with the duty of praying for all men. In the 6th verse, he also connects it with the extent of Jesus' redemption or ransom — thus expressly rendering the meaning of the words "all men," as universal as possible. I will quote the 5th and 6th verses. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time."

We wish to quote here previous to offering other comments, the following remarks by Dr. Whitby, whose general orthodoxy none will be disposed to dispute. He says:

"These verses contain several convincing arguments that God wills the salvation of all men in particular, and that Christ thus died for all. For, 1. The apostle here enjoins us to pray for all men, because *God will have all men to be saved*. Now it is unquestionably the Christian's duty, and was the constant practice of the church, to pray for all men in particular; and therefore the reason here assigned for this duty must reach to all men in particular. 2. The apostle reasons thus: *God will have all men to be saved*, because he is the God of all, the common Father, Creator, Governor and Preserver of all men. Now thus he is the God of all men in particular; and so this argument must show that he would have all men in particular to be saved.

3. *He will have all men to be saved*, saith the apostle; *for there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for ALL.* Now if the argument from one God was, as we have proved, designed to show that he is the God of all men in particular; the argument from this one *mediator* must also prove Christ the mediator of all men in particular. Hence he is here emphatically styled *the man Christ Jesus*, to intimate unto us, that having taken upon him the nature common to us all, to fit him for this office, he must design it for the good of all who were partakers of that nature; for as he was a man, he surely was endued with the best of human affections, *universal charity*, which would excite him to promote the welfare of all. As he was a man, he was subject to the common law of humanity, which obliges us to endeavor the common benefit of men." — *Annot. in loc.*

Such is the annotation of WHITBY, on the passage, and the argument is to our mind, equivalent to demonstration. Nevertheless, the learned commentator believed in and advocated the doctrine of endless punishment — with which, however, his reasoning is radically irreconcilable. We fully unite in his explanation of the will of God.

But it may be objected, that the expression, *God will have all men to be saved*, simply denotes the *desire* of the Almighty that such may be the issue. That his will of desire, and will of purpose may be different. Well, suppose we admit for the sake of the argument, that it is only a will of desire, and not of purpose. This does not invalidate our position in the least, for since if it be admitted that God *desires* the salvation of all men, it must either be conceded that all men will be saved, or the language of Scripture be denied that testifies, "the desire of the righteous shall be granted," Prov. x. 24. Now, it appears to me that he who "openeth his hand and satisfieth the desire of every living thing," Psalm cxlv. 16, will certainly so arrange matters as to satisfy his own. Besides: how does it consist with true theology, to allege, that the Supreme God *desires* a consummation which he has not *purposed* to effect? or that he *wills* a result which he does not desire?

Should it be denied that God desires the salvation of all men,

one of these positions must be taken: 1st. That God is wholly indifferent to the fate of the children of humanity; 2d. That he desires the endless wretchedness of our race; or 3d, That he desires the salvation of a part or portion of the human family, and the interminable misery of the rest.

The first and second positions are exploded by the testimony that Jesus "gave himself a ransom"—which argues against indifference, and proves a Divine desire for salvation to *some* extent; and the consideration that he "gave himself a ransom FOR ALL," demands a reply to the question, how the *one mediator* could consistently give himself a ransom for a greater number than the *one God* desired to save?

Moreover: since Jesus "gave himself a ransom for all," it must be admitted that all will be restored, or we must consent to the appalling conclusion that Christ died in vain! But the Bible instructs us to believe, that our blessed Master "shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied," Isa. liii. 11; and that he who "tasted death *for all*," Heb. ii. 9, shall finally "subdue all things to himself, and deliver up the kingdom to the Father, that God may be all in all."

Perhaps it may be urged that Jesus said of the city of Jerusalem, "How often *would* I have gathered thy children together," &c. "and *ye would not*." To this we reply, that there is a manifest difference between saying, "I would," and "I will"—the very form of expression denotes that the former is conditional, but the latter is positive—the first is a mere desire, the latter is a determination.

Again it may be objected, that God says he has "no pleasure in the death of the wicked," and that the wicked *do*, nevertheless, die." We answer, that a person's pleasure may not always be his will—but that Being, who is infinite in wisdom, will not *will*, or *determine* to do that which he well knows can never be performed. Besides, the very passage quoted, proves this to be the meaning—"As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live." Ezekiel xxviii. 11. The word "but" is from "be-out," to leave out, to omit. The plain meaning of the passage is, therefore, "leaving out" that the

wicked turn from his way and live, God has no pleasure in his death — or, in other words, rather than have the wicked *remain* sinful, he will visit them with moral death, in order that they may be turned from their evil way and live. Instead, therefore, of being opposed to our views, this passage is decidedly in their favor.”*

Yet again, it may be urged that the will of God, we have quoted, is only his revealed will, and that he has a secret will in opposition to it, which will lead to a different result! We answer this, by asking, “How did those who urge this objection, become acquainted with this secret will? Why have they dared to reveal God’s secrets? Can God be so deceptive as they represent him to be in this matter? But they are mistaken here for the will which we have quoted, *is* God’s secret will, now made known and revealed by him, through his chosen servants. For this will of God is not merely one of desire but one of *purpose*. This is taught by the apostle; “*God WILL HAVE all men to be saved.*” Besides, the testimony of the same apostle is, (Ephes. i. 9, 10,) God “*Having made known* [i. e. revealed] unto us the *mystery of his will* [i. e. the *secret* of his will,] according to his *good pleasure*, which *he hath* **PURPOSED** in himself, that, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him.” Now this cannot refer to those that *are already* in Christ; for such are already gathered together in one — for “there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye, [i. e. the believers] *are* all one in Christ Jesus. Gal. iii. 28. Again, to show that believers *are already* gathered into one body, in Christ, see Rom. xii. 4, 5; 1 Cor. x. 17, and xii. 12, 13 & 20 — “For as we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, being many, *are* one body in Christ, and every one members, one of another” — “For we, being many, *are* one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread” — “For by one spirit are we all baptized into one bo-

* A. B. Grosh.

dy, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." etc. "But *now are they* many members, yet but one body."

Thus it is to be seen, that those in Christ, are *already* gathered together in one, and hence the text must include those *out of Christ*, as well as those in Christ—literally "all things"—all intelligent beings in heaven and in earth.

But another objection may be presented, viz. that those in hell are not named, and therefore are excluded. We reply, that as hell is always declared in the Scriptures to be in the earth, so even those in hell are included. For proof that hell is in the earth, see Deut. xxxii. 22; (the first mention made of the word in our common version) 2 Samuel xx. 6; Jonah ii. 2; Psalm lxxxvi. 13, and Prov. ix. 18, &c. Besides, Professor Stuart, of Andover, and other eminent Partialist critics, admit that the phrase "things in heaven, and things in the earth," is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for *the universe*. It is, then, the *desire*, and the *purpose* of Jehovah to gather together in one *all things in Christ*. It is also further stated in the next verse 11th of this 1st. chapter of Ephes. thus, "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance BEING PREDESTINATED according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Could we have anything stronger than this testimony we have presented in evidence of the will and purpose of God to effect the salvation of the world?

Now, what God willed and purposed, he sent his Son to accomplish. The beloved apostle says, "We have seen and do testify, that the Father, sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world!" (1. John iv. 14.)

Again, what God willed and purposed, and sent his Son to accomplish, Jesus, in accordance with the mission he received, faithfully undertook. He "gave himself a ransom for all, tasted death for every man, and is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1. John ii. 2.) And yet again, what God willed and purposed, and sent his Son to accomplish, and Jesus in accordance there-

with undertook, shall be fully accomplished. The great apostle speaks of the consummation in terms of perspicuity and force: "Then cometh the END, when he shall have delivered the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. * * * And when all these things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also be subject unto him that put all things under him, that *God may be all in all.*" (1. Cor. xv. 24 — 28.)

We wish it to be carefully observed, here, that all enemies are not to be subdued by being imprisoned for eternity, or by placing the rebellious spirits where no further harm can result to the interests of Christ's Kingdom. O no! this is not the subjection of Christ. A slave or rebel may be subdued in this manner; chains may hang upon his body, yet still the mind may burn with vengeance, and *the man* be only outwardly subdued. This, as we before said is not the subjection of Christ. and if you will look at the passage last quoted, you will find that the text warrants the conclusion that all men are to be subdued by having their *enmity destroyed*, and becoming *willing* subjects of the King of Saints. Nay, the passage presents us with the fact, that these enemies are to become subject unto Christ *in the same way* that he is subject unto God. Remember "He must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet; and when all things shall be subdued unto him, *then shall the Son also Himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.*" God can never be all in all in a spiritual sense, until all are subjected unto Christ as he is to God, which, in fact, the Spirit testifies.

Another testimony with regard to the consummation of God's will and purpose, for which Christ was sent, and for which he labored, may be found in Paul's Epistle to the Romans. At the conclusion of the eleventh chapter, after tracing the successive stages of God's providence in the system of election, he makes it issue in the salvation of all the Jews, and all the Gentile world, and concludes the universal theme with the following

universal language : For God hath concluded them all in unbelief,[both Jews and Gentiles,] that he might have mercy upon all. O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God ! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out ! For who hath known the mind of the Lord ? or who hath been his counsellor ? Or who hath given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again? *For of him, and through him, and TO HIM ARE ALL THINGS ; to whom be glory forever.—Amen.*"

From the whole, we cannot conceive, a more connected and conclusive argument for the salvation of the world presented to the human mind. It is clearly established, that God, in the plenitude of his goodness, first *willed* the salvation of the world ; that this will is a will of determinate purpose ; that he sent his Son to execute his purpose ; that Jesus accordingly undertook the work ; and that, finally, the will, and purpose, and work, shall be consummated, in the subjection of all mankind to the Messiah's spiritual reign, as he is to be subjected to the Father, who shall then be *all in all*, to whom be glory forever.

III. Having thus spoken concerning the PROMISES of the Great Jehovah, and the WILL of the one living and true God ; we will, in the remaining time allotted us, present other promiscuous Scriptures, confirmatory of the same great truth of " the final holiness and happiness of all mankind."

1st. The Savior himself hath declared the universality of the accomplishment of man's salvation. " And I," says he, " if I be lifted up from the earth, *will draw all men unto me.*" John xii. 32. In this language our Lord does not intimate that he would draw those only to himself who in after times should believe in his name ; but he states, positively, that he would draw *all men* unto him, if he should be lifted up from the earth. So soon as the condition was performed, the declaration was numbered with the promises of the Lord, which are *yea and amen*. As the Savior *was* lifted, like the serpent in the wilderness, so must he draw, influence, or attract all men unto him. And this agrees with another testimony that is written, " The Fath-

er loveth the Son, and hath given *all* things into his hand.* * * All that the Father giveth me shall *come to me*; and him that cometh to me, *I will in no wise cast out.*" (John iii. 35; vi. 37.)

2d. The next passage we present is in the fifth of Romans. "Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Now it is very evident that this is the idea of the apostle here, that the free gift unto justification is as extensive as was the judgment of condemnation. And how extensive are they? Both are *universal*. As *all men* are condemned by the offence of one, "EVEN SO" are the same *all men* justified (i. e. made just) by the other. If it is said that the free gift was only *offered* by these means, but that many will not accept the offer, we reply, that such is not the doubtful character of the apostle's language. Besides, we have before proved that all must become willing subjects to Christ, even as he is to be subjected to the Father. But the apostle's language is emphatic: "THE FREE GIFT CAME UPON ALL MEN," not, *was offered to*. Look also at the next verse: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the righteousness of one SHALL many be made righteous." How extensive is the signification of the term *many* here? How many were made sinners? *All*. "So by the obedience of one," then, "SHALL ALL," or the same number, "be made righteous." And this agrees perfectly with the former verse. To be made righteous is the same thing as to obtain justification unto life. And the free gift came upon *all men* for this justification. The apostle continues — "Moreover, the law entered, that the offence might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound." Is not this a very singular expression, if, in millions of instances, *sin* is to abound *over grace*, and the triumph of sin be perpetual where grace (or favor) can never operate? The doctrine of unpardonable sin, and the idea of "sinning away the day of grace," we conceive are both repulsed by this gracious testimony; for grace must abound over sin, or this testimony is effectually repudiated. But the very next verse confirms and establishes the whole. "That as sin hath reigned

unto death," [that is, *universally*,] *EVEN* so might grace reign, [universally,] through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." We cannot discover any thing in this last verse which an objector can cavil on, except it be the term *might*. He may say that it is decidedly *potential*, and implies *possibility, power, will*, and this is all. We would direct him, then, to examine the 19th verse of this chapter, which has already been considered, where the *indicative* *SHALL* declares this fact, that all shall find righteousness by Christ. We also ask him to consider this whole subject, to take in all the connection, and say whether terms so absolutely universal, and so variously diversified, upon so glorious a subject, can possibly be reconciled with the *limitation* of God's blessings through Christ, upon the lapsed of Adam's race. We are satisfied that they cannot.

In confirmation of the views we have here expressed, we cannot well refrain from introducing an extract from Clarke's Works, showing that not only Universalists, but Partialists, have felt the force of the apostle's language here, and have fairly stumbled on the truth unconsciously, (at least, so it *appears*,) in utter contradiction to their creeds. We present it at any rate, as an ample comment on the text.

"As extensively, as deeply, as universally as *sin*, whether implying the *act of transgression*, or the *impure principle* from which the act proceeds, or *both*, *hath reigned*; *even so*, as extensively, deeply, and universally *might grace reign*, [here is the potential,] filling the whole earth, and pervading, purifying, and refining the whole soul, *through righteousness*, through his doctrine of free salvation, unto eternal life, *by Jesus Christ our Lord*. Thus we find that the salvation from sin here, is [here is the indicative] as extensive and complete as the *guilt* and *contamination* of sin: death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and *SIN TOTALLY DESTROYED*. Here is glorying to Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and has made us kings and priests to God and his Father, be glory and dominion, forever and ever, Amen! Hallelujah! The Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen and amen."

Here is the force of truth! and the glory of truth. Who could think that such an exposition of this Scripture, and such an exclamation, would proceed from a Partialist believer in the endless perpetuity of sin and misery? Yet so it is, that truth, which is powerful, will sometimes apparently make men forget their creeds, and exult in the salvation of the world. Verily, the good Doctor, when he penned this language, must have felt, not merely that he was bound for the kingdom of love himself, and would ask all others, "Will you go to glory with me?" but by the eye of faith he was enjoying a rich foretaste of that blissful period, when not only he, but all the sons and daughters of humanity, should have arrived at the kingdom of glory.

3d. We pass to the Epistle to the Corinthians. We have already noticed part of this testimony; but there is still another passage which, with its connection asserts the universality of final blessedness: "As in Adam *all die*, even so in Christ shall *all be made alive*." (1. Cor. xv. 22.) If the word in the first instance conveys the idea of universality, so also must it in the second. To be made alive in Christ is to be raised to a state of immortality, in opposition to the mortality of those who die in Adam. But is this all? Is it only to be raised to immortality? We say, that it is to be raised to immortality *and glory*. For the apostle goes on to state the *order* of the resurrection, (order of time,) and in the three orders which he mentions — Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at his coming, then the end, when all enemies shall be subdued unto him, that God may be all in all — in these three orders or successions, all mankind are not only included in the resurrection of immortality, but in the resurrection of glory; for as before shown, they are to be subjected unto Christ as he is to the Father! And, further, no man has ever yet shown, or ever can show, that in this account of the resurrection to immortality, there is any limitation in number, even to the 42d verse, where we are instructed that "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in dishonor; it is *raised in glory*." And, further yet, (to the 49th verse,) "As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." And so on till

verse 51: "We shall all be changed," and "Death," (verse 54,) to every son and daughter of Adam, "is swallowed up in victory," and the apostle renders thanks for all, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

We say no man has ever yet shown, or can show, that there is any limitation in numbers, from the all that die in Adam, to the number who shall be raised in glory and bear the image of the heavenly. No, the chapter is a glorious one — yea, we may say the best one in the Bible — and which alone would render the Bible a *Universalist Book*. The ultimate and universal prevalence of immortality, virtue, and happiness is thus plainly disclosed, and asserted with all the energy and dignity worthy of the exalted theme. Let any person look it over and see if we are not correct. It avails nothing to say that this Epistle was addressed to "the church of God." We know this: still, *in* that Epistle, the apostle speaks of mankind at large, and asserts, most plainly, their resurrection to immortality and glory.

We forbear introducing more passages of direct scripture testimony; not to be sure, because there are none others, for there are those we would be glad to present, particularly from the Epistles to the Phillipians, Colossians and Timothy; — but because we should go beyond the limits allotted us this evening. We have given a part only of what might be given; but we have aimed to present a few undoubted passages; not parables, but plain testimony, and trust the argument to them. We have given under our second division what to our minds would be sufficient, without any further scriptural array. "That is a pillar of everlasting truth. For ourself we could do with the very PURPOSE of the Almighty; but when we see that purpose put in execution — when we see Jesus sent by the Father, and coming to accomplish his unalterable will — and when we see the END described, the grand consummation of the divine government emphatically declared to embrace the *whole* in a resurrection of immortality and glory, — we are more than doubly assured that this is Christianity — this is truth.

Brethren and friends, permit me to exhort you to give heed to the inquiry of our text; "What saith the scripture?" search

the scriptures "to see whether these things are so;" "prove all things, and hold fast *that which is good*." Having found the truth, openly profess it and faithfully practice it, and you *will* receive the end of your faith, the salvation of your soul."

AMEN.

DISCUSSION,

PART II. NO. II.

IN THE METHODIST CHURCH, APRIL 11, 1843.

BY F. YATES.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him."

PROV. XVIII. 17.

I HAVE chosen this text as a suitable motto for my reply to the discourse to which you have just listened. My opponent speaks of his situation as being an unpleasant one to his feelings on the previous evenings of the discussion. He may be assured that it was no pleasing task to his opponent to be under the necessity of presenting arguments a *second* time, which were deemed as conclusive proof of the question at issue, and have them passed by, with complaints about language used and the spirit manifested, — unnoticed.

I hope to be able to pursue a more honorable course in my attempts to reply to his arguments. They shall stand before the audience as he presents them, and when I am unable to meet them by fair reasoning, I will yield the point. I contend not for victory over an opponent, but for the defence of truth. I am happy to confess that on this occasion my opponent has taken a manly course, and his sentiments are plainly and distinctly set forth. And I respectfully solicit the candid attention

of every individual, while I undertake to show you that his proof texts do not sustain his position.

He remarks that as he is "wholly confined to the scriptures," he is "obliged to omit the thousand arguments" he "might derive from reason, from the workings of God's spirit on the renewed heart, and from God's teachings in nature." If the scriptures teach this doctrine, and if he can make this appear, this will be enough. All we ask is, "What saith the scripture?" Let him produce *one* declaration from the word of God that "all mankind will be finally holy and happy," and we will close the controversy, and strike hands as brethren of the same faith. We believe God's word, and what that declares we will rejoice to acknowledge. "To the law, and to the testimony."

I. He first introduces testimony from the Old Testament, as he says, to prove the "doctrine of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began;" Acts iii. 21. My opponent regards this text as amounting to the same as the expression that "all mankind will be finally holy and happy," and therefore has introduced it here instead of the question under discussion. But is it so? Let us read commencing with the 18th v. "But those things which God before had showed, by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath fulfilled. Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive *until* the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. *And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.*" Now, if the "restitution of all things" in this text refers to "the final holiness and happiness of all mankind," the text, of course, must relate to the *future* state. It cannot serve his purpose unless it is applied there. But the very moment this is

admitted two points are established entirely fatal to universalism. 1. It will be settled that Jesus Christ is to come again. For, "*he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; Whom the heaven must receive UNTIL the times of the restitution of all things.*" This is plain, literal language. The Father "*shall send Jesus Christ whom the heaven must receive until*" this time. 2d. At this time "*it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the people.*" When Jesus Christ shall come, at "*the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy Prophets since the world began,*" he shall *destroy* those who do not believe in him, and obey his gospel. The simple meaning of the passage is, that God will accomplish "*all things*" which has been declared by the prophets. When he will produce testimony from "*all the holy prophets*" that God will finally restore all mankind to holiness and happiness, and will reconcile the two points above named with his doctrine, I will yield the point.

I now come to the testimony which he has produced from the Old Testament to prove his doctrine that all mankind will be finally holy and happy. It is Genesis xxii. 18, "*In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.*" By quoting the renewal of this promise first made to Abraham, to Jacob, and the mention of it by Peter, he makes it read, "*In thy seed shall all the nations, families and kindreds of the earth be blessed.*" It is evident that the terms families, and kindreds are used instead of nations, and mean the same thing. He has discoursed at some length on this promise, and he evidently regards it as one of his strongest proof texts.

We will now attend to his remarks on this text, and see if they are in accordance with Bible truth.

1. He first contends that the promise is *universal*, and introduces an extract from Dr. Clarke to show that "*Partialists are constrained to acknowledge the universality of this language.*" For my part I am not at all "*constrained*" on this point, but I *rejoice* to admit it. But does this argue that all men will be finally holy and happy? By no means. "*It is perfectly easy to conceive that all the nations of the earth, and all families of the*

earth can be blessed with the gospel of Christ, without supposing that every individual of all nations must consequently be saved. We as a nation, are now blessed with the gospel, or are blessed in the seed of Abraham, but every individual of our nation is not blessed with personal salvation." But more of this hereafter.

2. He next proceeds to notice two objections to his use of this text. The first objection, that these promises are not gospel promises I do not urge. I admit that they are gospel promises, or promises realized in the gospel. So far we agree — but now comes the point at issue. He contends the promises are wholly *unconditional*, but I shall contend, and hope to be able to maintain that they *are* conditional. It is understood of course, that the blessing promised here is *Christ* particularly. So far as the promise of his advent is concerned, I grant it is unconditional. He was to come, and he did come; and "by the grace of God he tasted death for every man." And by his death all nations were brought into such a state as that God can now "be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," (Rom. iii. 26.) So far the promise is universal and unconditional; but justification from sin is conditional — holiness is conditional, whether present or future. These are the blessings brought to view in this promise in Jesus Christ, as the scriptures will plainly show.

Before noticing his arguments on the unconditionality of salvation, I wish to make a few remarks that I desire our hearers to bear in mind. My opponent has based this argument on the supposition that Jesus Christ is the author of the unconditional salvation of all men. Or rather, he has labored to establish this point. Now let it be remembered that he denies the doctrine of atonement by Jesus Christ altogether. He does not believe that Christ saves us from a single pang of deserved punishment in this life. Every man must at all events, suffer all his sins deserve before he can be saved. (Wonder if there is any condition here?) According to his theory, Christ cannot save us from the *commission* of sin, for we must all sin as long as we live. He does not save us from *future* punishment, for we are not threatened with any punishment after death. In

what sense then is Christ our Savior? If he undertakes to prove that all men will be saved through Christ, it is devolving upon him to show us *how*. I will here ask my opponent one plain question, and request from him a definite answer in his next. *In what sense does Christ save us from our sins, if not from the commission of sin, or for punishment due for sins already committed?* If he assures us that Jesus Christ will save all men, he ought to tell us *how*. It may be that he has changed his views on the atonement since our discussion in the school house, if so, his present course will appear the more consistent. At any rate, it will be rather unfortunate for him to come forward *now* and deny the doctrine of the vicarious sufferings of Christ, for it will entirely destroy his whole argument, on which he now relies so confidently.

But waiving this inconsistency, we will now notice his arguments, or what he may call arguments, to prove that our salvation is unconditionally secured in Jesus Christ. 1. He thinks our salvation must be unconditional, because "there is nothing in the promises *themselves* that is conditional." I have admitted that the promise in question is unconditional in a qualified sense. But so far as our salvation is concerned, I shall show you presently that it *is* conditional. 2. He remarks that "these promises are either unconditional, or else God's veracity is impeached. To say that *faith* is any part of the condition is the veriest absurdity. For the *promise* is the very thing to be believed." He acknowledges that men ought to believe, but that the promise is true whether we believe it or not. His argument amounts to this: God has promised to bless all nations in Jesus Christ. This promise is unconditional and absolute. All men are required to believe that they have eternal life in Christ; but if no one should ever believe this, they have it in store for them nevertheless! I wish here to point out two errors which my opponent has fallen into. The first is in supposing that the blessing promised is the final salvation of all men in Jesus Christ.

Secondly, that a mere assent to this truth is the faith required in the gospel. These are the very points to be proved be-

fore his conclusions can be legitimate. The fallacy of this argument consists in supposing that men are required to believe that they have eternal life unconditionally given them in Jesus Christ. That there is eternal life in Jesus Christ we admit; but that it is unconditionally given to sinners, or that they are unconditionally made partakers of it we deny. The simple facts are these; there is life in Jesus Christ, life for all who will accept of it on gospel terms; but in order that the sinner may be made the partaker of this life he must believe and be connected with Christ by faith, as a branch is connected with the vine. "I am the vine, ye are the branches: If a man abide not in me he is cast forth as a branch and is withered, and men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." John xv. 5, 6. From this it must appear, that though there is life in Christ, yet it cannot save the sinner, who does not believe in him, any more than the life and nourishment which is in the vine can preserve the branch, when severed from it. There is life in Jesus Christ, but what good can this do that class of sinners of whom Christ says "ye will not come unto me that ye might have life," John v. 40.

That gospel faith is something more than the assent of the mind to certain truths is clear from James ii. 19 — 22. "Thou believest there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works *is dead?* Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith *wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect!*" Here we see how Abraham was saved. He obeyed God. And Jesus Christ "being made perfect, *became the author of ETERNAL SALVATION to all them that obey him.*" (Heb. v. 9.)

But my opponent says, to say that faith is any part of the condition of the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham, "is the veriest absurdity." He refers to Gal. iii. to show that it is a gospel promise, and I will refer to the same chapter to prove that so far as it relates to *us* it is conditional. I will read the entire chapter. [See the place.]

What can be plainer than that Paul makes our participation in the blessing promised to Abraham, depend upon the condition of faith? If there is absurdity in this, is not *Paul* chargeable with it? The apostle most clearly makes a conditional application of this promise, showing that none can enjoy the blessing of Abraham, who are not imitators of his faith. Let us hear him again, Rom. iv. 11, 22, 23, 24. "He [Abraham] received the sign of circumcision, as a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of *all them that believe*. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, IF WE BELIEVE ON HIM *who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead*." Look again at the testimony of Gal. iii. "*So then, they which be of FAITH are blessed with faithful Abraham. For ye are all the children of God BY FAITH in Jesus Christ; AND IF WE BE CHRIST'S, THEN ARE YE ABRAHAM'S SEED, AND HEIRS ACCORDING TO THE PROMISE.*" These quotations from the apostle clearly show that the promise of God to Abraham was conditional, so far as it related to the salvation of individual sinners, and that none but believers can be Abraham's children, and heirs with him of the promised blessings. But my opponent says the promises are confirmed by the oath of God. This is granted, but it does nothing towards proving the salvation of all men, since no one contends for the doctrine of endless punishment, on the ground that the covenant will be violated on the part of God. The oath of God renders the covenant sure for its true intent and purposes, but we have abundantly shown that it contains conditions to be complied with on the part of man; and by a non-compliance with these, the sinner may forfeit his interest in it, and come short of the promised blessing, though God remain ever true to his word. He quotes Heb. vi. 17, 18. "Wherein God willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise, the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled

for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us." It cannot be overlooked that this text limits the object of the oath to those who flee to lay hold on the hope set before them; hence, the oath of God secures the blessing to no others. We ask, then, have all men fled to lay hold on this hope? This cannot be pretended. True believers in Christ Jesus only have done this. Swearers, liars, drunkards, and infidels have not fled to lay hold on the hope that is set before them. Until it be proved that all men embrace the gospel, and by faith lay hold on the hope it holds out to our fallen race, this text can prove nothing in favor of universalism; but this point cannot be proved of many, the words of Christ are as true now as when he uttered them, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life."

I trust it is now shown conclusively that this promise furnishes no support to universalism, but when properly understood it presents an unanswerable argument against the doctrine of the final holiness of all mankind, inasmuch as it makes our salvation in Jesus Christ *conditional*. It will not answer for him to say that the salvation treated of by the apostle relates to this life, for he has already applied it to the future state; and by that means has put a weapon into my hands with which to demolish his whole system.

If he would like to have a little more on conditions, he may reconcile the following texts with his doctrine of unconditional salvation; and when he has done this, I will furnish him with another chapter: — John iii. 16. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, *that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish but have everlasting life*, — Heb. v. 9. "*And being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him.*"

II. His second argument in favor of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind is founded on the *will of God*, as taught in the New Testament. He takes for his proof text 1 Timothy ii. 3, 4. "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God, who will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth." — I cheerfully admit that it is

the will of God to save all men. I rejoice to acknowledge all that the text asserts. It will not be necessary, therefore, to notice his long argument to prove this point. The question at issue now, is this: Is God's will done in reference to the human family? If I can show that the will of God is *not* done *now* in reference to the conduct and condition of men, I think it will be rather difficult for my opponent to prove that his will respecting their final salvation will be accomplished.

In support of the position that the will of God is not now done, I remark,

1. God has given to man a law, which of course is his will to man; for the law is the will of the law-giver: It is made known to us that God wills our salvation, yea, the salvation of all men, but not irrespectfully of their moral agency. He wills the salvation of all men on gospel terms; but all men as moral agents do not comply with the terms of the gospel. My opponent admits that it is the duty of all men to believe in Christ *now*. Yes, this is the will of God that all men should *now* be saved "and come to the knowledge of the truth." But all do not believe--all men have not come to the knowledge of the truth; therefore the will of God is not done even in the sense of the text. This text as clearly proves that it is the will of God that all men should "Come unto the knowledge of the truth," as it does that he wills that all men should be saved. Now, it is clear that all men do not "come unto the knowledge of the truth;" and those who defeat the will of God in this respect, will also find it defeated in its purposes of their salvation.

2. Plain matter-of-fact, both from observation and scripture testimony, shows us that the will of God is not done.

It is the plain will of God that men shall not *murder*, yet they *do* murder—that men shall not *lie*, yet they *do* lie—that they shall do as they would be done by, but they do it not. So we might go through the whole catalogue of precepts, and find that they are all disregarded by men every where. In every instance of transgression the will of God is not done. Here is plain matter-of-fact, and "facts are stubborn things." But the scriptures furnish instances in which the will of God, and the will of man is in opposition, and the will of man prevails.

The lamentation of Christ over Jerusalem is to the point. "How oft *would* I have gathered thy children together, but ye *would not*." My opponent has noticed this text, in the following manner: "To this we reply, that there is a manifest difference between saying "I would," and "I will" — the very form of expression denotes that the former is conditional, but the latter positive — the first a mere desire, the other a determination."

In reply to this, I remark,

1. There is an admission here that the will of God, so far as desire is concerned, *has failed*. 2. This "manifest difference" does not exist between this text and the one 1 Timothy ii. 4. God does not say that he *will* save all men, neither does the apostle say that God will save all men. It is evident that it was God's will to save the people of Jerusalem, and he sent Jesus Christ to do his will. He labored for their salvation, according to the will of God, but they "*would not*" receive him, though it was the will of God that they should receive him. It was God's will to save them, just as it is his will to save all men, "but the very form of expression denotes it to be conditional." So his will may not be undone, or it may be done. Thus his argument destroys itself.

God wills the salvation of all men — now, and that they should come to the knowledge of the truth, as the means of effecting it, but all men are not now saved. It is said to the Laodiceans, Rev. iii. 15, "*I would* that thou wert either cold or hot;" but they were *neither*. Here God plainly declares that they were not what he *would* that they were; hence, his will was frustrated in the moral character of this luke-warm church. It is useless to spend time to prove that the will of God is not done in all things by man; for every sin is a violation of the divine will. God has given us his commands and what he has commanded, he wills that men should do; but men do them not. "The law that speaks in deep toned thunders from the cloudy summit of Sinai, and the gospel that breathes a pardon upon the repenting sinner, in the milder voice of a crucified Redeemer, alike declare that the will of God has been violated."

We will now examine his scripture testimony to prove that all men will be saved, because God wills the salvation of all men. I regard what has already been said, a sufficient reply to the argument drawn from the will of God, but I wish to notice these texts for the purpose of showing that they furnish no support to his doctrine. In proof that God desires the salvation of all men, (which I readily admit,) he quotes the following passage: "He [Christ] gave himself a ransom for all;" and adds, "since Jesus 'gave himself a ransom for all,' it must be admitted that all will be restored, or we must come to the appalling conclusion that Christ died in vain!"

My opponent has introduced several texts which speak of our redemption by Jesus Christ to prove that all men will be saved. Indeed, his whole argument drawn from the promises of God, and from the will of God, rests for its support on the doctrine that the death of Christ is the procuring cause of our salvation, — a doctrine which he denied in toto but a few weeks since. In a late meeting with my opponent in a certain school house, I presented the doctrine of atonement as an argument in support of the doctrine of endless punishment. I laid down the following proposition:

The atonement made by Jesus Christ argues that man was in a lost state, and must have remained so for ever without it; and also that the proper penalty of the law of God is endless death. I then introduced scripture to prove that Christ "bore our sins in his own body on the tree" — that he "gave himself for us that he might redeem us" — that he "tasted death for every man." Then my opponent denied that the sufferings of Christ were vicarious. According to his theory, man never lost the favor of God, never lost his right to heaven, — was never exposed to future punishment, — he must suffer all that his sins deserve here, and yet he talks about Christ's giving "himself a *ransom for all!*" Here he has given me another weapon with which to overthrow his system.

The English word *ransom*, contained in the above text, is thus defined by Dr. Webster.

RANSOM, *n.* 1. The money or price paid for the redemption

of a prisoner or slave, or for goods captured by an enemy. 2. Release from captivity, bondage or the possession of an enemy. 3. In *law* a sum paid for the pardon of some great offence and the discharge of the offender; or a fine paid in lieu of corporal punishment. 4. In *scripture*, the price paid for a forfeited life, or for delivering or release from capital punishment. 5. The price paid for procuring the pardon of sins, and the redemption of the sinner from punishment."

If then Christ "gave himself a ransom for all," in the above sense there is no room for further controversy. The text teaches that he has ransomed sinners from the bondage of sin and the punishment to which they are subjected by the divine law, by paying his life a price for theirs. But the argument on the conditionality of salvation will show that the benefits of the atonement, so far as the personal salvation of moral agents is concerned, are conditional.

Now we inquire whose system is it that makes Christ's death in vain? On the theory of my opponent, the death of Christ does not save us from sin in this life, any further than his doctrine and example would have done without his death. It does not save us from the punishment of sin, for all *must* suffer all that their sins deserve; and besides it would be *unjust* for the innocent to suffer in the place of the guilty. Neither does his death save us from endless death, for no one was ever exposed to it. From what then does the death of Christ save us? Why, from — nothing! And thus we are led to "the appalling conclusion that Christ died in vain!"

With these views of the atonement, with what propriety can he argue the final salvation of all men on the ground of Christ's death? until he can reconcile these difficulties his argument destroys itself.

Next in course we find certain objections anticipated and answered, which refer to the will of God being done. I have already noticed his remarks on the lamentations of Christ over Jerusalem. — The next objection which he attempts to answer, is the text in Ezek. xxxiii 41. His remarks on this text present such a rare specimen of logic and criticism that I will not deny our hearers the pleasure of listening to them again. Here they are entire: —

“ Again it may be objected, that God says he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked; and that the wicked *do*, nevertheless die. We answer, that a person’s pleasure may not always be his will — but that Being who is infinite in wisdom will not *will* or determine to do that which he well knows can never be performed. Besides, the very passage quoted, proves this to be the meaning. As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live, Ezekiel xxxiii. 11. The word ‘but’ is from ‘be-out,’ to leave out, to omit. The plain meaning of the passage is, therefore, ‘leaving out’ that the wicked turn from his way and live, God has no pleasure in his death, or, in other words, rather than have the wicked *remain* sinful, he will visit them with moral death, in order that they may be turned from their evil way and live. Instead, therefore, of being opposed to our views, this passage is decidedly in their favor.

I don’t know how I can better this. I will just present the whole verse, and leave our hearers to judge of its “plain meaning.” “Say unto them, as I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; *turn ye, turn ye, from your evil way; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?*” My opponent says, “rather than have the wicked remain sinful, God will visit them with *moral death*; in order that they may be turned from their evil way and live!” I must confess, this is a *new idea* to me. I never before learned that God must first visit the sinner with *moral death* in order that he *might live!!* Surely, if this is God’s method of salvation, I shall be obliged to give up *beat*, for as all have been “visited with moral death,” all will consequently be saved. But the scriptures tell us that “the soul that *sinneth* it shall die,” — “the wages of *sin* is death,” — “*sin* when it is finished bringeth forth death.” Now if moral death is a visitation from God, and sin is the instrument which effects this death, then it follows that *God is the author of sin!* Is this according to the law and the testimony?

To prove that God has *purposed* to save all men, he introduces Eph. i. 9, 10. “Having made known to us the mystery of his will, according as he had purposed in himself; That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together

in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." The plain meaning of this text is, that the Christian Church is not to be limited to the Jews, but that God hath purposed that the Gentiles also are to come to Christ, and share in the blessings of the gospel. This will be seen by turning to chapter iii. 4, 5, 6, "Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the *mystery of Christ*, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of man, as it is now revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets by the spirit; *That the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ.*" The same promise is referred to here, that was made to Abraham, and our hearers will remember that it does not prove the unconditional salvation of all men. But it may be urged that the text speaks of gathering "together *all things* in Christ." I reply that this cannot prove that *all* will be saved; for my opponent admits that the phrase "all things" does not mean all men. He says it "*cannot* refer to those that are already in Christ."

My opponent, in noticing the objection that those in hell are not named in this gathering, replies, that "hell is always declared in scripture to be in this earth." This declaration comes with rather an ill grace at this time, for I presume our hearers recollect that I proved on the last evening of the discussion, that the Savior threatened with the punishment of hell *after* the death of the body; and this argument he did not meet.

He quotes Eph. i. 11, as proof that God will save all men, but this stands in connection with the preceding verses already noticed, and can mean nothing more. So far as the *plan* of salvation in Jesus Christ is concerned, He "works all things after the counsel of his own will." This salvation has been *proved* to be *conditional*.

I will here make a remark concerning the *will* and *purposes* of God. There is, as my opponent has remarked, a manifest difference between his *will* as it respects *desire*, and his *absolute purposes*. The former is what we have proved may be frustrated, but the latter cannot fail. God's purposes are seen in his law, and in the fundamental principles of the gospel. His law is given to moral agents, as a rule of moral action. He has joined to his law a penalty. This law has been viola-

ted, and consequently, men are exposed to its penalty. This penalty is *death*. Jesus Christ has “tasted *death* for [or instead of] every man;” and the purpose of God in reference to our salvation is now brought to view in this text: “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, *that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting life.*” He purposes that he that believeth shall be saved — and he that believeth not shall be damned.”

The remarks of my opponent the other evening about the signs that follow them that believe, I presume, were appreciated by the audience. All must know that they (the signs) related particularly to apostolic age, as evidences of the truth of their mission, while the text remains as the statute law of the gospel, — “He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned.” Thus it will be seen that the *absolute* purposes of God are opposed to the unconditional salvation of all men.

His quotation from 1. Cor. xv. to prove the final subjection of all men in a spiritual sense, I think, will be found as fatal to his cause as his other proof texts. I will quote a little more than my opponent has — enough to give the obvious meaning of the passage. I will commence with the 21st v. “For since by man came *death*, by man came also the *resurrection of the dead*. For as in Adam *all die*, even so in Christ shall *all be made alive*. But every man in his own order; Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ’s AT HIS COMING. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is *death.*”

On this text I submit the following remarks: —

1. The death and resurrection of the *body only* is treated of in this chapter. Not one word said in all this “glorious chapter” about “the final holiness and happiness of all mankind.” It assures us that *all* will have a resurrection, but it is not *once* said that all shall be made holy and happy. But I shall show you that it teaches the contrary doctrine.

2. The text teaches that Jesus Christ is to make his second advent at the end of this world—a doctrine entirely fatal to the theory of my opponent. Speaking of the *order* of the resurrection the apostle says, “*Christ the first fruits, afterward THEY THAT ARE CHRIST’S AT HIS COMING.*” This, my opponent says, is literal language. If so the resurrection of the righteous must take place when Christ comes. It is certain that he must make his personal appearance at the time of the resurrection. This is plainly asserted by the same apostle in “plain, literal language,” 1 Thess. iv. 16. “*For the LORD HIMSELF shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first.*” Thus his proof text bears on its very face a doctrine which he has positively denied in the course of this discussion, and which destroys his whole theory! Let this be remembered.

3. At the coming of Christ here spoken of, his enemies shall be “put under his feet.” This my opponent *assumes* is a “spiritual and willing subjection to Christ.” This is entirely without evidence. On the contrary, it is plain this subjection is *not* voluntary, but that it is the subjection of enemies to *destroy* them. They are “*put under his feet.*” This does not imply their restitution. An enemy may be subdued without being restored to favor. “The apostle,” says Mr. Isaac, “here undoubtedly alludes to the custom of conquerors treading on the necks of their enemies. The captains of Joshua put their feet on the necks of the five kings they had subdued; but it was preparatory to their destruction, not to their restoration.” Other scriptures which speak of the transactions to take place at the time of the resurrection will fully confirm this view of the subject. We will introduce Matt. xiii. 36—43. Let it be remembered that this is not a *parable*, but the *explanation* of a parable. “And his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man: the field is the world: the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest

is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burnt in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things which offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear."

This is Christ's explanation of his own parable, and it clearly teaches what the subjection of his enemies will be at the resurrection. Matt. xxv. 31—46, teaches the same doctrine, notwithstanding all that my opponent has said to the contrary. In my first article I urged seven objections to his application of it, which were so many arguments in favor of mine, since no one contends for a third application of it. These arguments he did not meet. In my last I repeated four of them at greater length, which I consider as unanswerable arguments in favor of a general judgment, when these events will take place mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. Again, Christ plainly teaches, John v. 28, 29, that all will not come forth to spiritual life at the resurrection: "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This is "plain, literal language."—That God's enemies will be destroyed, and not made holy at the coming of Christ, is evident from the "plain, literal language" of Paul, 2 Thess. i. 7—9, "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; *who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.*" I must still urge this as one of my proof texts, for my opponent has not proved his application of it. It confirms the doctrine of his proof text in Corinthians, that Christ is to come at the resurrection, while it clearly shows what the subjection of his enemies will be. Thus far his arguments turn against his own system with resistless force.

I would like to say much more on this chapter, but time will not allow it. Enough however, to show this chapter, instead of being sufficient to render "the Bible a Universalist Book," rears its unyielding front against his doctrine, and boldly bids defiance to all his sophistry.

III. I must notice his "promiscuous scriptures" very briefly, for the want of time. His first text is in John xii. 32. "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." My opponent remarks on this text, that Christ "states positively, that he would draw all men unto him, if he should be lifted up from the earth. So soon as the condition was performed, the declaration was numbered with the promises of the Lord, which are *yea and amen*. Here we have it again, — the salvation of men depends on the death of Christ." What farther proof need we of the falsity of a system, when one argument adduced in its favor *necessarily destroys another*? But this text does not prove the unconditional salvation of all men, as the Savior plainly shows, John iii. 14, 15. "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, *even so* must the Son of Man be lifted up; *that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.*" We will let this testimony decide the question.

2d. His next scripture is Rom. v. "Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." I would be glad, if time would permit, to discuss at large the important doctrines of this chapter, but I must content myself with a very few remarks at this time. In this chapter are clearly and distinctly brought to view doctrines which my opponent will not allow for a moment. For instance, that through the offence of Adam death and condemnation have passed upon all men. Universalists deny that death in any sense is in consequence of Adam's transgression. Now let us look at the last verse, about which he talks so smartly, and on which Dr. Clarke's remarks are made, which he has quoted. "*That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.*" Now nothing is plain-

er than that “*death*” on the one hand is as extensive as “*eternal life*” on the other, consequently, if we do not obtain “eternal life by Jesus Christ,” eternal death must be our portion. Eternal death, therefore, is the effect of sin. Will he admit this? How can he avoid it with the use he has made of this text? Let him answer. Dr. Clarke, in the very extract he has read, remarks, that sin “hath reigned, subjected the whole earth and all its inhabitants, the whole soul, and all its powers and faculties, *unto death, temporal of the body, spiritual of the soul, and eternal of both.*” We might show also, that the vicarious sufferings of Christ are clearly taught in this chapter. “*Christ died FOR [INSTEAD OF] the ungodly.*” Indeed, his argument depends on this—Does he admit it? We shall see. The chapter teaches us that through “the free gift” the original curse is so far removed, that all men are now justified” in relation to it, — so that those who die in infancy, or, those who do not involve personal condemnation, are unconditionally saved in Jesus Christ; and such as are thus condemned, may be “justified through faith.” And also, by means of Christ’s death, all shall have a resurrection. That personal offenders are justified, or saved conditionally, is evident from verse 1. “Being justified *by faith*, we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

If he will risk his system with a full investigation of this chapter, he can give it a prominent place in his rejoinder. I am apprehensive the result would be fatal to his cause.

I have now examined his proof texts, as far as my limits would permit, and I will leave our hearers to decide if he has *proved* that “all mankind will be finally holy and happy.” Have I not *clearly demonstrated* that his very proof texts are all fatal to his doctrine? You are the judges. I have *proved* that the promise made to Abraham is *conditional* as it respects our salvation. If this is farther disputed, the controversy is with St. Paul — not with *me*. It has been *proved* that God has not willed or determined the *unconditional* salvation of the human family, but the contrary. Thus, I think, the candid will decide. With the prayer that God will guide *me* and my opponent, with our hearers, to a saving knowledge of the truth, I close these remarks.—AMEN.

DISCUSSION,

PART II. No. III.

IN THE METHODIST CHURCH, APRIL 25, 1843.

BY E. FRANCIS.

"I am set for the defence of the gospel."

TEXT — PHILIPPIANS 1. 17.

I HAVE deemed this a fitting motto, for the remarks I have to present to your notice this evening. It was my object, on a former occasion, to produce a few scripture testimonies of the gospel. Those my brother attempted to refute by three arguments, namely, (1.) That the promises of the gospel, made to the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, & Jacob, are conditional; (2.) That although it is the will of God that all men shall be saved, yet that will, will not be accomplished; and (3) that the resurrection the Savior taught, and about which the apostles wrote, — to immortality and glory, — was only the raising of the body from the grave to life.

As, therefore, "I am set for the defence of the gospel," it becomes my duty to notice these arguments, like a true soldier of the cross, wielding "the sword of the spirit which is the word of God."

It will not be out of place, should I remark — that the word Gospel, signifies good news, glad tidings.

In order that no wrong impression may be held by those who listen to this discussion, I wish to remark once more that this discussion was not of my seeking. My brother borrowed for his text the same passage in the Book of Proverbs, that I used in my first reply to him. Thus it will be seen that "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him," — applies not to me, in this discussion, but to my brother.

He complains that he presented arguments in support of his awful sentiment of endless wo, a second time, but I did not so much as notice them. I will notice this lamentation no farther, than to say that I am willing to submit all I have advanced, to the candid judgments of our honest hearers. I prefer that they should decide this matter for themselves, and not that I should set up mine one notion as infallible; and for fear that they should not conclude with me, after the subject is before them, take upon myself the bold presumption of telling them just how much I have done!! There are some people in this world who are fond of exhibiting the spirit of boasting Jehu, saying, "come see what I can do;" such would do well to learn modesty from those who had charge of their early years; and also to imitate the spirit of him who was "meek and lowly of heart."

I. My brother's remarks upon the passage in Acts iii. 21, where Peter speaks of "the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began;" need not be examined, as I did not present it as one of my proof texts.

The first scripture testimony I quoted in proof of "the final holiness and happiness of all mankind;" was the promise made by the great Jehovah to Abraham, renewed to Isaac, and confirmed to Jacob, (Genesis xxii. 18; xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14.) that in their "*seed shall all the nations, families and kindreds* (Acts iii. 25.) *of the earth be blessed.*"

The *universality* of this promise, my brother says — "*I rejoice to admit.*" So then we agree that *all*, every individual, who belongs to any nation, family or kindred, however far gone in heathen darkness, superstition and sin he may be, *shall be*

blessed according to the promise; for none will argue that there are individuals who belong not to some family, to some kindred, or some nation! My brother also agrees with me that the promises are gospel or glad tidings promises. But he believes that they are conditional, or rather he tells us that they are both *unconditional* and conditional.

Before noticing this position I will glance at some remarks he saw fit to make in this connection, in which he attempted to bring in certain views I advanced concerning the atonement previous to this discussion; by so doing he has clearly exhibited his ignorance of my views of the atonement, or else has grossly misrepresented me. As, however, I have heretofore said nothing upon this matter in the discussion, I will only remark, that when the doctrine of a vicarious atonement is the theme of dispute, I shall not fail to sustain my own views from the scriptures.

My brother says, "I will here ask my opponent one plain question, and request from him a definite answer in his next. *In what sense does Christ save us from our sins, if not from the commission of sin, or from punishment due for sins already committed?* If he assures us that Jesus Christ will save all men, he ought to tell us *how*."

I reply, that this is not the place to discuss these questions. If I can produce testimony from the Holy Bible that Christ Jesus shall save his people — all that the Father hath given him — *from their sins*; it is sufficient so far as our main question is concerned. If all men are to be saved, we need have no fears but successful means will be put in operation to accomplish this object, by the infinite Ruler of the universe.

But to the argument for the conditionality of the promises. My brother says, "It is understood of course that the blessing promised here is *Christ* particularly. So far as the promise of his advent is concerned, I grant it is unconditional. He was to come, and he did come; and by the grace of God tasted death for every man, &c." "But justification from sin is conditional — holiness is conditional, whether present or future. These are the blessings brought to view in this promise in Jesus Christ, as the scriptures will plainly show." I reply, that

Christ is indeed the blessing promised, and the proof that *he is the blessing*, I before presented from Matt. i. 21, "Thou shalt call his name *JESUS*, for he shall save his people from their sins;" and again Acts iii. the apostle testifies to the Jews that in accordance with the promise God sent his son to bless, "*in turning away EVERY ONE FROM HIS INIQUITIES*" i. e. in saving EVERY INDIVIDUAL "FROM HIS SINS." My brother will not assert that this passage in Acts iii. 26, has reference *only* to the Jewish nation, as being blessed in this life, since it cannot be shown that EVERY ONE of that people were then, or ARE NOW TURNED AWAY FROM THEIR INIQUITIES. The preceding verse answers the question who are to be blessed in Christ; which testimony is, that God covenanted with Abraham, saying, "*And in thy seed SHALL ALL THE KINDREDS of the earth be blessed.*" Is there any condition expressed or implied here? I can discover none. If there is, will my brother point it out distinctly? It teaches that Christ shall bless the whole human family "*in turning every one from his iniquities.*" If it can be shown that one of our race will not eventually be turned from his iniquities, then the argument in defence of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind," from the promises, is of no avail. But as saith the apostle, the promises are not *yea* and *nay* but *YEA* and *amen* unto the glory of God, all shall be thus blessed! Yea, even my brother has acknowledged that in accordance with this promise *Jesus*, "*by the grace of God tasted death for every man.*" And yet, notwithstanding this concession, he is disposed to wrest its simple meaning. He asserts that the promise is the very thing the christian must believe, is only conditionally true. And this he says "the scriptures will plainly show." Where do they show this? The passages he produced from John xv. 5, 6; v. 40; James ii. 19 — 22; Heb. v. 9; Gal. iii; Romans iv. 11, 22, 23, 24. Do not teach us that it is wholly depending on the faith of man whether he shall *ultimately* be a participant in the blessing promised or not.

And here I remark once for all, that I would thank my brother when he attempts to notice one of my proof texts, to give it something more than a mere assertion; and then produce a string of passages that he thinks refutes my idea drawn from

the proof text. In pursuing the course he has in this instance, he only arrays scripture in opposition to scripture, and thus leaves the matter no plainer than before. Observe carefully how he attempts to prove his assertions!

My brother has not appeared to notice the fact that there are two kinds of salvation spoken of in the scriptures; namely, a salvation that is enjoyed by the believer in this life, through faith in the gospel, about which none of us disagree; and the ultimate salvation, or "final holiness and happiness of all mankind."

Should any desire to know in what the special salvation of believers consists, this is my reply: In believing the glorious truth that *God is the Savior* of all men, they "enter into rest," Heb. iv. 2; they are filled "with joy and peace," Rom. xv. 13; they "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory," 1 Peter i. 8. In believing the truth they enjoy the presence of the COMFORTER, which is "the *Spirit* of truth," John xv. 26. Their faith works by love and purifies their hearts, Gal. v. 6; Acts xv. 9. Enjoying "the full assurance of *faith*," they possess also "the full assurance of *hope*," Heb. vi. 11; x. 22; and they set their seal to the truth of the record, that "*perfect love* casteth out fear, because fear hath torments; he that feareth is not made perfect in love," 1 John iv. 18. Theirs is a *living faith*, because it is a faith in the living God; and *in believing* that the living God is the Savior of all men, they enjoy the special salvation, 1 Tim. iv. 10. Blessed, thrice blessed are they who know the joyful sound.*

It is concerning the future, eternal salvation of the whole human family, that we are discussing.

It is not necessary therefore, that I should examine his scripture passages that speak of faith or belief here. I will notice however, one, John iii. 18. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The next verse is — "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved!"

This testifies that the believer should "*have everlasting life*" in this world, it was something to be enjoyed here; his faith in

* A. C. Thomas.

Christ as the Messiah whom God sent *not to condemn the world, but to save it* according to the promise, was his blessing here. He was not required to have faith in something that was not true until he believed it; it was just as true before as after. I will thank my brother to discriminate between those scriptures that speak of salvation in this life, and the future salvation. But it is not necessary that I should dwell longer upon this subject. The promises are that *all* the nations, families and kindreds of the earth shall be blessed, in Christ, by being saved from their sins. I love to receive the plain testimony of Jehovah where there is nothing of doubt or obscurity connected with it, and rejoice in view of the glory it reveals.

II. My brother says of 1 Timothy ii. 3, 4, "I rejoice to acknowledge all that the text asserts." The passage is as follows: "For this [i. e. supplications, prayers, &c.] is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." My brother says, "I cheerfully admit that it is the will of God to save all men." This is all that I contend for, namely, that he that "doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth," Dan. iv. 35, and "Who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will," Eph. i. 11, should be acknowledged as the God "who *will have all men to be saved* and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." Yet, notwithstanding this acknowledgment, my brother asserts that this will not be the case, because he thinks God's will is not done here. He therefore proposes the question, "Is God's will done in reference to the human family now?" The substance of his answer, is, that it is not. And thus he militates directly against the testimony before quoted, that God "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." He says God's will is not now accomplished, but produces no scripture testimony, save that before noticed. For my part I prefer to believe the plain teachings of the record, and let him who presumes to assert the contrary reconcile that with the Holy Book.

But admit for a moment that God's will cannot be done, that he who is infinite in power, is not able to accomplish his own will and purpose; (how absurd!) what then? Whose will shall be

done? Why, according to my brother's argument God has created men free moral agents, and has given them this agency so that he can have no effectual influence over them, and thus, as he thinks, that their will is and will continue to be opposed to God's, they cannot be saved.

Again, if it is through faith alone, possessed here, that all shall finally be saved, how will infants, idiots and heathen be saved? Will these all be lost? When do these exercise faith in this life? Will my brother reconcile these questions with his arguments? But such is not the testimony of Paul, an Apostle of the Lord Jesus, he says God "*will have*" — is there any doubt or contingency here? God "*WILL HAVE ALL MEN to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth.*"

To be sure all men may not be saved from sin in this world. I may ask, are there any pure and sinless persons of the age of manhood in the earth? Show me such an individual and I will confess myself to have been in error upon this point till now. I say we may not behold all men freed from sin in this world, but this is no proof that they *will not eventually* be freed from sin. Paul says (1 Tim. iv. 6) Christ Jesus — "*gave himself a ransom for ALL TO BE TESTIFIED IN DUE TIME.*"

Upon this passage my brother is under the necessity of bringing up again my views of the atonement. They seem to trouble him greatly, although I have said nothing about it in the discussion.

But allowing my brother's views of the atonement to be correct, viz. that Christ made a vicarious sacrifice, in suffering death upon the Cross, by which he atoned for the sins of men; how does that effect the argument from the text, that "Christ Jesus gave himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time?" For if Christ gave himself a ransom for all it is not necessary that it should be experienced here, if it is only proved to be true *ultimately*. This *will* be the case, for the apostle testifies that the ransom is to be testified *in due time*. This we believe. If there are any conditions here, let my brother point them out, I can discover none. No! There are none. *Christ Jesus did give himself a ransom for all, and this will be testified IN DUE TIME.* Mark those three words *in due time*.

It matters not so much from what or how men are ransomed, so long as they are ransomed, and that ransom my brother admits is "for all," and to be testified in due time.

My brother next notices my remarks upon Ezekiel xxxiii. 11. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live." He has quoted the entire paragraph, and offered comments which virtually amount to saying that he cannot comprehend its meaning. Yet he has quoted the scripture testimony, that "the soul that sinneth it shall die," "and the wages of sin is death," &c. which is in perfect agreement with the remarks alluded to; God will visit the wicked with moral death, in consequence of their sins, and thus shall they be turned from their evil way and live; in accordance with the blessing promised in Christ "every one shall be turned from his iniquities;" thus passing from moral death unto life. He next notices Ephes. i. 9, 10 — God "Having *made known* unto us the mystery of his will according to his *good pleasure*, which he *hath* **PURPOSED** in himself, that, in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him."

The declaration is, that God hath purposed to gather together in one *all things in Christ*. To this my brother replies, that "this cannot prove that all will be saved; because he says, I admit that the phrase "*all things*" does not mean all men." Where did I admit any such idea? Why, in this language; I said concerning the whole passage; "This cannot refer to those that *are* already in Christ; for such are already gathered together in one." &c. Did I admit any thing like what he charges upon me? At the close, I said, "the text must include those *out of Christ*, as well as those in Christ — literally "*all things*" — all intelligent beings in heaven and in earth." I wonder that my brother should thus unblushingly, accuse me of what my manuscript before him, plainly showed to be false.

His remarks about *hell*, are out of place here, they were noticed under the former part of the question under discussion.

I next notice his remarks upon the will and purposes of God,

only so far as to observe that he says "THE LATTER [the purposes of God] CANNOT FAIL." Very well, then, we need have no doubts of the fulfilment of the apostle's declaration, God having made unto us [i. e. revealed to the believers] the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure, which *he hath* **PURPOSED** in himself." What hath he "*purposed*" that "cannot fail?" listen! "he hath purposed," that in the *dispensation of the fulness* of times he might gather together in one, **ALL THINGS IN CHRIST**, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth, even in him.

I pass now to notice my brother's remarks on 1 Cor. xv. The substance of his argument, is, that only the resurrection of the body is spoken of in this chapter. He says, "It assures us that *all* will have a resurrection, but it is not *once* said that all shall be made holy and happy. *But I shall show you that it teaches the CONTRARY DOCTRINE.*" Where has he shown this? I suppose he intended to prove it by the 23d verse. The 22d verse is as follows: "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." The next two verses are, "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." "*Then* cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power." Now it is very evident that only the order of time, in which the resurrection is to take place, is spoken of. The apostle testifies, *every man in his own order*, Christ the first fruits, they that are *Christ's at his coming*, then, **THE END**. But my brother rests his strong argument on the words, "*they that are Christ's at his coming*;" he produces scripture testimony to show that Christ's second advent is yet future, part of which testimony has been already examined in the course of this discussion. This, however, is not the place to reply, and even were I disposed to do so, it would not be my duty until my reasoning upon the passages had been successfully refuted.

But so far as the order of the resurrection is concerned, the time of Christ's second advent does not effect the position I have taken, for the apostle testifies, concerning the *ultimate re-*

sull, which is all I am contending for; he says, verse 24th, "THEN THE END, when he [Christ] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power — 25th, For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet." But I may suppose my brother will contend that such will not be the case, for although this is the will and purpose of God, yet as man is a moral agent, he will not be raised or made alive in Christ, unless he is disposed to be. Nay, this is not my brother's view, he says, "that ALL *will* have a resurrection." But then, he conceives that it is only our earthly bodies that are to be raised, and in proof of his argument that all men will not be participants of a spiritual life at the resurrection, he quotes among other passages, John v. 28, 29, "Marvel not at this: for the hour is not coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." Our inquiry here, is, does this passage have reference to the same resurrection taught in 15th chapter of first Corinthians? We answer, no! Does this testimony in John v, relate to the resurrection of our mortal bodies? No! and my brother makes no effort to prove that it does!

Similar language occurs in Daniel xii. 2, the connection of which is quoted by Jesus, in Matt. xxiv. 15, 21, and applies to the period of the destruction of Jerusalem. This passage in John refers to the same period. It is true, that being in *the graves* is spoken of — but in Ezekiel xxxvii, *the whole house of Israel* is represented as being in *their graves*, which only signified their state of bondage in Babylon, from which the Lord promised to bring them out, and to place them in their own land. The word *resurrection* in the passage in John, affords no proof that the allusion is to a rising into an immortal state — for, as Dr. Campbell justly observes, "this is neither the only, nor the primitive import, of the word *arastasis*. It denotes simply, being raised from inactivity to action, or from obscurity to eminence, or a return to such a state, after an interruption."*

* A. C. Thomas.

I do not feel required to explain the passage in question, as no attempt was made to prove that it had reference to the immortal state of existence.

But in order to show that the resurrection in John v, 28,29, had reference to something long since past, I will quote the 24th and 25th verses of the chapter, where Jesus testifies : “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, *hath* everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation : but *is passed from death unto life.*” What ! had the bodies of the believers in Jesus, passed from mortality, from death, unto immortality, to life ? none will contend thus. Then this portion of the Savior’s language cannot refer to the immortal resurrection. But listen to the next verse. “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, *and now is, when the dead* shall hear the voice of the Son of God ; and they that hear shall live.” The hour is coming *and now is when the dead shall hear, &c.* Does this mean that the bodies of those who had been dead and buried in their graves for ages on ages, did then hear and live ? Every one must allow that the resurrection here spoken of was a moral resurrection. I would thank my brother to discriminate in his quotations upon the resurrection ; for, as we have endeavored to show, a different signification is given to the word, by the connection in which it occurs.

But to the chapter in Corinthians. The testimony in the 22d verse is written thus, “ For as *in Adam* ALL die, even so *in Christ* shall ALL be made alive.” My brother admits that the word ALL in each member of this sentence, is expressive of *universality* — for though Enoch and Elijah were translated, they must have underwent a change which was equivalent to death. “ By *Adam*, in the passage before us, I understand the mortal constitution of the first man who was of the earth, earthy. All the children of humanity bear this image, as a mortal being : and in that image they must return to the dust whence they were taken. By *Christ* I understand the quickening spirit, the Lord from heaven, the heavenly. By being *made alive in Christ* is signified the resurrection into a state of incorrup-

tion, power, glory ; in a spiritual body ; in the image of the heavenly, who is declared to have been " the image of the invisible God." As it is not optional with man whether he will or will not die in Adam, so I judge it to be not a matter of choice with him, whether he will or will not be made alive in Christ. The promise is *absolute*, and in the fulfilment thereof, man is necessarily *passive*. " For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ SHALL all be made alive."

Thus far there is perfect unity, I believe, between our views of the resurrection. But my brother's general argument, assumes that no renovation is to be effected by the power of the resurrection — or as popular opinion expresses the sentiment, " as death leaves us so judgment finds us ; there is no change after death." And hence, he argues concerning the eternal destiny of any individual, from the condition in which he was when he died. He inquires, how he laid down in the grave, and with what feelings and in what estate he departed this life. But in the days of Paul the queries were, "*How are the dead RAISED UP ? and with what body do they come ?*" (1 Cor. xv. 35.) The answer is given in the voice of inspiration : It is raised in *incorruption, power, and glory ; a spiritual body*, in the image of the glorified Redeemer. " For as in Adam ALL die ; EVEN so in Christ shall ALL be made alive." And " if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," (2 Cor. v. 17.) It is written, " The dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be *changed*." It was in prospect of this great and glorious change, that the apostle could HOPE for the resurrection even of THE UNJUST, Acts xxiv. 15. He surely could not have *hoped* for the resurrection of the *unjust*, if he had believed they would be raised from the dead simply to suffer the unutterable pangs of endless torment ! The doctrine of the Messiah was, " In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are equal unto the angels ; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection," (Matt. xxii. 29, 30.) In prospect of a resurrection of this glorious and sublime character, we may truly "*rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory*."*

* A. C. Thomas.

I will notice a passage my brother cited in his remarks upon the conditionality of salvation, it will not be out of place here. I refer to John xv. 5, 6 — Jesus said to his disciples, “I am the vine, ye are the branches : If a man *abide not in me*, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered ; and men gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” The argument drawn from this passage is, that the sinner, he who abides not in Christ, will be cast off, having not been fruitful in good works. Yea, even that some who have been connected with Christ, as the branch is with the vine, i. e. by faith, or belief in him, will be cast away. We admit, as before remarked, that the salvation of the believer here, dependeth upon his faith here, and that many who have believed in Christ, have fallen back again into condemnation, a state of unbelief. “But to be in Christ in this mutable state, surrounded by temptation, exposed to the power of deceptive influences, and liable each moment to be led into sin, is a very different matter from being in Christ in an unchanging state, removed from the influence of tempting and corrupting circumstances. He who is in Christ even in this life, is a new creature—for he “has put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, and has put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness” — but he may revert to his former estate, and be cast off as an unfruitful branch. Now if it can be proved, that any who is a member of one of the kindreds of the earth, who shall be a participant of the blessing promised in Christ, and who may be made *alive in Christ*, (in the immortal resurrection) in incorruption, and in a spiritual body, and who is, therefore, a new creature, will not *abide* in Christ, or will ever again put on the old man which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, then it will be proved that such an one will be cast off — but not otherwise.*

But we return to Matt. xxii. 29, 30. “Jesus said to the Sadducees, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God : for in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.” In the

* A. C. Thomas.

parallel place in Luke xx. 34—36, it is written : “ The children of this world marry and are given in marriage ; but they which are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage : neither can they die any more ; for they are equal unto the angels ; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.”

My brother perhaps may say to this testimony, that were it not for this clause ‘ they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead,’ he could receive it in proof of my position. I will therefore now meet this objection. “ The Sadducees did not accredit the doctrine of immortality, and the case they presented [of the woman who had seven husbands,] was merely designed to perplex our Lord. Their inquiry assumed that conjugal affinities must exist in the future life, (if a future life there be) as in the present ; and that *there*, men would possess many, if not all, the passions which are here developed. Hence they desired to know whose wife of the seven brethren the woman should be in the resurrection. The supposition that our Lord evaded the inquiry, is not admissable ; and since it will freely be conceded that his reply was pertinent, we conclude that he referred directly to the resurrection state. He contrasts the present state of being, in which matrimonial alliances are contracted, with the incorruptible and spiritual life, in which no such ties are formed. If it be alleged that some of our race shall not be accounted worthy to be raised from the dead, the doctrine of endless punishment must be discarded, unless endless punishment can be conceived of, without a resurrection. But since it is granted by my brother, that all mankind shall be the children of the resurrection, he must admit that they will be the children of God. It will not do for him to assert that some of the human family “ will be undutiful and rebellious children forever, for this is exploded by Rom. viii. 21, “ the [rational] creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the *glorious liberty* of the children of God.”

In his address to the Sadducees, our Lord simply intended

to correct their error as to *the condition* of men in the future state. They supposed, as previously mentioned, that the passions which men possess in *this* world, they would possess hereafter; and they imagined that the difficulties of the case they presented, furnished an unanswerable objection to the doctrine of immortality. The promise was false. Hence said Jesus, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God." Then properly followed a correction of the error referred to.

In replying to an inquiry pertaining solely to *the condition* of men, that is their *mode of being*, in the resurrection state, our Savior did not feel called upon to say *how many* would be raised from the dead. The doctrine of the *Pharisees* (some of whom were present) restrained the resurrection to *the just*, which restriction our Lord did not see proper directly to deny on that occasion. Neither did he then deny the Pharisaic notion of the transmigration of souls. Indeed, he did not, at that time, expressly dispute *any* doctrine of the Pharisees — otherwise the Scribes would not have commended his remarks, Luke xx. 39. But are we to infer that he countenanced their notion, that only a part or portion of our race will be raised from the dead? Certainly not. He was replying to a question of *condition* not of *number*. He certified the Sadducees, and he certifies *us*, that as many as shall be raised shall be equal unto the angels; and the assurance that they shall be the children of God, is predicated of the fact, that they shall be the children of the resurrection. Moreover, Christianity teaches that all who bear the image of the earthy, and die in Adam, are by the Supreme Being accounted worthy to be made alive in Christ, in the image of the heavenly. Hence Paul could HOPE *for the resurrection even of THE UNJUST*, Acts xxiv. 15. He *expected* it — he *desired* it; and the conjunction of *expectation* and *desire* produced in him a hope full of immortality. He looked in faith "for that *bles-sed hope*, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ," Titus ii. 13, "who shall *change* our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself," Philippians iii. 21. He speaks of *change from mor-*

tality to immortality as A VICTORY OVER DEATH — as the means of introducing the whole family of man into a state of ineffable bliss, where “the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces;” 1 Cor. xv. 54, 56; Isa. xxv. 8. And he enjoyed so clear a view of this sublime consummation of the reign of Christ, that he was enabled abundantly to “rejoice in hope of the glory of God,” Rom. v. 2.

1 Cor. xv. 28: “And when *all things shall be subdued* unto him, then shall *the Son*, ALSO himself be subject [or subdued] unto him that put all things under him, [or rather, that subdued all things unto him] that GOD MAY BE ALL IN ALL.” It will be perceived that the word ALSO in the passage, debars the popular cavil that some will be subdued to God in one way, and the rest in another; and I know of no rational exposition of the language, *that God may be all in all*, if a part of our race are to be eternally excluded from the enjoyment of his love.

There are many important considerations connected with the Bible doctrine of the resurrection, which I should be pleased to notice, but I will confine my remarks to three particulars: 1st. The testimony of Jesus, that “in the resurrection they are the children of God, BEING the children of the resurrection,” destroys the popular notion, that the condition of man in the future state, will be determined by his character or conduct in this. Our Savior does not say, “In the resurrection they are the children of God, *having been* my disciples in the present world.” No. The assurance that they shall be *the children of God*, is predicated of the simple fact, that they shall be *the children of the resurrection*. 2d. The Holy Spirit does not speak of the future blessedness of individuals, *as such*. All the members of the human family constitute *the body* of which Jesus is the head. “The head of *every man* is Christ,” 1 Cor. xi. 3. He tasted “death for *every man*,” Heb. ii. 9. “In Christ shall ALL be made alive.” God “will have ALL MEN to be saved.” “*Every knee shall bow*.” These and similar forms of expression, plainly show, that the Holy Spirit has revealed the future condition of mankind *as a whole* and not *as individuals*. 3d. The scripture doctrine of the resurrection, exposes the folly of the inquiries which are so frequently made as to the condition in

which a man has died. Is it sown in corruption? it shall be raised in incorruption: is it sown in weakness? it shall be raised in power: is it sown in dishonor? it shall be raised in glory: is it sown an animal body? it shall be raised a spiritual body: has the person died in Adam? he shall be made alive in Christ: did he bear the image of the earthy? he shall also bear the image of the heavenly. The questions should not be, How do mankind die? in what condition do they depart? but "How are the dead RAISED UP? and with what body do they COME? Allow the scriptures to furnish the reply, and the believer of the record will rejoice in the assurance, that in the resurrection *universal humanity* shall walk forth in the beauty of holiness, redeemed and regenerated by the quickening spirit of the living God.'*"

III. My brother's remarks upon my promiscuous proof texts, must be passed by, for want of time, with but a word of comment. What he says on Romans v. amounts to nothing more than telling me, that it is directly opposed to the universal reign of grace distinctly taught in the conclusion of the chapter. Had he shown the fallacy of my argument drawn from that, or attempted to do so, it should be noticed. His apparently convicting me, (in a remark made extemporaneous,) of misrepresentation in quoting from Dr. Clarke, amounts to nothing, as any one will discover by examining his commentary. My quotation from Dr. Clarke was made with reference to the extent of the reign of grace, and not to show that he was a Universalist. In order that there need be no misunderstanding, I will again quote the same as before, with the words my brother wishes. [The quotation referred to will be found in Part II. No. 1, of the Discussion.]

Does my brother call his charge against me honest? Is it Christ-like? Does it become one professing to be a disciple, a minister of the Lord Jesus? It was my design to produce much other testimony in support of the glorious gospel, or glad tidings of a world's salvation, but my limits do not admit.

"God is admitted by all christians, and declared by the Bible,

* A. C. Thomas.

to be *infinitely good*. There can be, therefore, nothing *too good* for him to do. Endless sin and endless misery is admitted by all christians to be *infinitely evil*. The Bible declares any sin to be an evil. It follows then, that an *infinite evil* is directly contrary to God's whole nature and character. On the other hand, universal and endless salvation from sin, and restoration to holiness and blessedness, is perfectly in accordance with God's whole nature and character. From these considerations it follows, that Partialism, or the doctrine of endless sin and wo, requires *more proof* to establish it, than does the doctrine of Universalism — because it is less in accordance with God's nature and character, and therefore less probable.

Again, our Partialist brethren all admit, (I presume my brother will not deny this,) I say they admit that every one of God's attributes and perfections is in favor of universal salvation, except the single attribute of justice. Suppose them correct, and you have holiness, mercy, benevolence, wisdom, goodness, love — all testifying one way; and, justice, only, against them. What should you believe — the doctrine of the one, or that of the many? But justice, as imperatively as any other attribute of God, requires endless and universal reconciliation to God, purification from all iniquity, salvation from all sin, and obedience to all God's commands. Justice never did and never will require man to be endlessly sinful; for if it did, it never would punish man for sinning. Justice and holiness unite with all the other attributes of God in requiring man to be just and holy — and being directed in their efforts to reclaim the sinner, by infinite wisdom, they *will* succeed — they *cannot* fail."*

That God is infinite in goodness, wisdom and power; the scriptures, as well as all nature, plainly teach. This my brother will not deny. From these premises then, I make a few suggestions, to which I invite his particular attention in his reply.

Is it possible "that an infinitely wise and benevolent God would bring into existence millions of immortal souls for the express purpose of making them endlessly miserable? All an-

* A. B. Grosh.

swer, no. Then, of course, you believe that He designed to make them endlessly happy, and arranged His plans accordingly. Now can you persuade yourself that if God, having infinite wisdom to devise, and infinite power to execute, did *really* devise and design the happiness of man, He will, nevertheless, be so utterly foiled and defeated, that the very opposite of this will happen? We will not stay to inquire how this happens. It is enough that God, in the creation, designed and planned the happiness of man, and that this plan will be so completely frustrated that the greater part of the human race will be endlessly miserable, according to my brother's doctrine. I ask, is it possible to believe this, and also believe that God is perfect in power and wisdom? But again — if God in his great love designed and sought the happiness of his family; and, after all, the greater part of them shall prove irredeemably vicious, and at last be swung off from the scaffold of judgment into an eternity of sinfulness and suffering, is it possible to believe that God will be satisfied and happy with such a frightful termination of his benevolent plans? And if he is not satisfied nor happy, will he not be miserable? Is it possible for you, my hearers, to believe a doctrine which involves such terrible consequences, and so mars and marks the plans of God with weakness, blindness and disappointment? Is it possible to believe that if any of the human race shall be endlessly miserable, God did not know it before he created them? “Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world,” Acts xv. If he did know it, why did he then create them? Is it possible to believe that a God of infinite mercy and benevolence would calmly and coolly go to work and create millions of beings, knowing all the time that the existence he was giving them would prove an endless curse to them? What would you think of that parent who should suspend his child by a frail thread over a dreadful precipice, with wild and ferocious beasts howling at the foot of it, uncertain whether the thread would hold or break? Would you not think him a monster? What, then, would you call this monster, if you were told that, before he suspended his child over the precipice, he *knew certainly* that the thread *would* break, and the little sufferer be dashed down the ragged

rocks, and torn in pieces by the howling brutes below! If the doctrine my brother believes is true, then is endless misery, this dreadful precipice, and devils, the raging beasts at its foot — and God, before He gave being to that portion of His children who are to be irretrievably lost, before He suspended them over the frightful abyss by the thread of existence, *knew certainly* that that thread would break, and they be hurled down, down amid the screaming and raging fiends below! My hearers, it is fearful — *can* you believe it?

Again — Is it possible that “free agency” is any apology for these terrible evils? Do you say that man might save himself if he would? But does that take from the force of the truth that God *knew he would not*? Was he not perfectly sure, when he gave man free agency, that a part would so abuse it, that it would prove their final and endless ruin? Why, then, did He bestow on these the fatal gift? Do you reply that man must have been either a machine or a free agent? Well, admit that free agency was a necessary part of the mental constitution of man; would it not have been better to have created only those who He foresaw would make a good use of it, and so be endlessly happy; and have left those who He foresaw would make it the cause of their destruction, uncreated, so to speak? We press the question — why give existence at all where it was necessary to connect with that existence a principle which would certainly through all coming time fill it with indescribable woe and pain? Is this benevolent or merciful? Is it possible to believe that God, *our* God would do it?

But again — It is acknowledged that God in creating man, designed to make him endlessly happy. Now is it possible to believe that, this being His real purpose, He would at the same time bestow on man a principle which he foresaw would certainly defeat the very object of his creation? What would you think of that man who should make a watch to keep the time, and then introduce into the work a wheel which he knew would prevent the watch from keeping time, and forever render it useless?” Now, if my brother’s doctrine be true, this is precisely the course pursued by God — creating man to be endlessly happy, and then inserting in his spiritual machinery the wheel of

free agency, which he knew at the time would make him endlessly miserable! Is it possible to believe this? Can you, can my brother believe it?

My brother has acknowledged that it is God's will that all men should be saved. If then, God would save all mankind, but *cannot*, is he infinite in power? If God *can* save all mankind, but *will not* is he infinite in goodness? I will thank my brother to carefully examine these questions, drawn from the acknowledged character of God, as revealed in the scriptures, in his rejoinder. They are affirmative arguments with me.

We have already shown in what the special salvation of the believer consists, and desire attention to the argument thence deducible in proof of Universalism. "Since the spirit of truth is styled the '*Comforter*,' there can be nothing tormenting in the Christian faith. On the contrary, he who believes "the truth as it is in Jesus," enters into rest; is filled with joy and peace; yea, he rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory." Now, I ask, will my brother contend that, "faith in the doctrine of endless wo, in any of its modifications, can fill the soul with the peace of God? Will he contend that the prospect of interminable wretchedness for any of our race, can cause the believer to rejoice with unutterable joy. To what heart is the spirit of eternal wrath the comforter.

Let me come a little nearer those of our hearers who are parents; you love your children. He who touches *them*, in the way of injury, touches the apple of the father's and the mother's eye. You rejoice in their happiness. Your heart is inclined to them in all the tenderness of parental love. Can you bear the thought that any of them shall be the subjects of endless damnation? Can you rejoice in believing that a son or daughter shall be sentenced to the doom of darkness and despair forever? Pardon me for asking these questions. You have parents' hearts, and I *know* that rejoicing is a stranger to your souls, whenever you mentally grant that some of your offspring *may be* eternally lost! But even supposing you to be satisfied that yourself, your companion, your children, your parents will certainly be saved, is there not still an aching void in your heart? Are you *filled* with joy and peace? Believing that

any number of mankind will be miserable world without end, can you rejoice with *joy unspeakable* and *full of glory*? In contemplating the endless ruin, the undying agony, of millions of your brethren in the human race, do you experience the celestial influences of the comforter? But why should I press these questions? Are you not, and do you not possess the feelings of men and women? Yet "if you are not comforted by faith in the doctrine of endless hell torments — if you rejoice not with unspeakable joy in believing that a part of mankind will be doomed to unutterable wo, — either the doctrine in question is false, or your heart is not right in the sight of God! The allegation that you expect *hereafter* to rejoice in the damnation of the impenitent, is nothing to the purpose — for, in the first place, if you believe the *truth* you will be comforted *now*, you will rejoice in believing; and in the second, I have yet to learn that the resurrection will change man into a fiend!

But I gladly turn from the contemplation of a doctrinal system devised in the wisdom of the world, which is foolishness with God — a system fraught with the most blasphemous and revolting conclusions; and with feelings of love invite you to take a careful and full view of the doctrine of illimitable grace. "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away *the sin of THE WORLD*," John i. 26. Behold in faith the triumphs of redeeming love! Behold the issue of the reign of Christ!

"Then the end; beneath his rod,
Man's last enemy shall fall;
Allelulia! Christ in God —
God in Christ *is all in all!*"

In dwelling on this glorious theme the heart grows warm in gratitude and love, and the kindling glow of the Comforter, the spirit of truth, is felt in the soul. Truly the living can "rejoice with *joy unspeakable* and *full of glory*," in anticipation of the blissful era, when the hand of the believing God shall wipe the tear from every eye, and hush in every breast, the rising sigh forever. And here consists the special salvation he enjoys. It is a salvation from the fear that hath torment — it is a deliverance from the bondage of the fear of death, Heb. ii. 14. It

is the result of unwavering confidence in the fulfilment of the absolute promise of the Almighty, that all the nations, families and kindreds of the earth, shall eventually be blessed in Christ.”*

AMEN AND AMEN.

* A. C. Thomas.

DISCUSSION,

PART II. No. IV.*

IN THE METHODIST CHURCH, APRIL 25, 1843.

BY F. YATES.

"But there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ."

GALATIANS, I. 7.

It would seem that there were those in the days of the apostles, who were not satisfied with the pure gospel of Christ, but who differed very essentially from the plain truths it inculcated. Some of these had found their way into the church at Galatia; and in order that they might the more successfully palm their false notions off upon the Christian Church, they came as *gospel ministers*. "We, (say they) are set for the defence of the gospel — hear us." But the apostle Paul met these self-made ministers, and faithfully exposed them. In every age of the church, the robe of the sanctuary has been stolen, with which to propagate the most absurd and dangerous errors.

My opponent thinks he is set for the defence of the gospel, and he says "the gospel is good news," &c. So say we, the gospel is good tidings of great joy, but not so on the hypothesis that universalism is true. To be sure, its advocates tell us that all is well, no danger, no one lost, no one can be lost. The gospel, which is such *good news*, only assures us that we

were never in danger of the wrath to come, never in danger of hell fire, and never can be lost. This is glorious news! A man runs through the country in time of peace and quietness, when no one imagines any danger, and cries "good news! good news! glorious tidings!" and when inquired of what it is; "O, there is no war — no danger of war." The people would laugh at his folly. But here is another case: A famine was prevailing to a great extent in the city of Samaria. The people were dying with hunger by multitudes. The four leprous men who stood at the gate, went to the camp of the Assyrians, which, to their great joy and astonishment, they found in their quiet possession, with an abundance of provisions. "This," said they, "is a day of *good tidings* — let us declare it to the king's household." Now if Samaria had been full, and there was no danger of want or starvation, this would not have been a day of such good tidings. Again, if any in the city had been disposed to doubt the message, and had perished in consequence, it would have been a true message, and good tidings still, notwithstanding their unbelief. So the gospel. It comes to a guilty and perishing world, with offers of pardon and salvation. These offers are made to all people, and it is good news, whether men receive it or reject it. On the supposition that men have exposed themselves to endless punishment by transgression, and have no means of saving themselves from this awful doom, the gospel, which brings to view a plan of salvation through Jesus Christ, is indeed good news. My opponent thinks I had better let our hearers decide whether my arguments have been answered or not, and not presume to set myself up, &c. I reply, that when my principal arguments are passed by a second time without even a notice, I have a right to remind him, and our hearers of the fact; and I shall not sit at his feet to learn lessons of modesty. I presume our hearers will recollect that my arguments presented and *repeated* to prove my application of Matt. xxv. 31 — 46, to the future state, were not even noticed, though his attention was called to them especially. Other prominent ones might be named.

I. He thinks he is under no obligation to notice my re-

marks on the text he quoted from Acts iii. concerning the "restitution of all things," as he did not produce it as one of his proof texts. If he did not introduce it as a proof text, he regarded it as teaching that all men will be finally holy and happy, and has quoted it frequently in the course of this discussion. Now that I have met it, and proved from the text and its connection, that it is *fatal* to his theory, he drops it by saying he did not introduce it as a *proof text*. Would he have passed by in silence, the two arguments I raised against his doctrine from one of his own texts, if he could have done any better.

The *promise* made to the ancient patriarchs, he still contends must prove the unconditional salvation of all men, but he has used no new argument to prove this, neither has he reconciled this idea with Paul's application of the promise.

Although I consider the remarks made in my first reply sufficient on this point to satisfy any one who is willing to receive the plain testimony of God's word, yet I will here add a few remarks to show our hearers again, the obvious import of the promise in question.

It is admitted that it is universal and unconditional in some respects. 1. So far as it relates to the advent of the Savior, it is unconditional, and his death has procured blessings which are universal and unconditional, such as our temporal blessings, for "in him we live and move and have our being." And blessings of a spiritual or gospel character — deliverance from the original curse, — "For as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift *came* upon all men unto justification of life." In this we see how infants and idiots can be saved, and those heathen too, who obey the law that is written on their hearts by the "Spirit that enlighteneth *every man* that cometh into the world." But 2. It is perfectly clear, that so far as it relates to individuals who have involved personal condemnation, and who are capable of receiving the gospel, and of embracing its terms, *it is conditional*. We say those who are capable of receiving the gospel, for the word of God addresses

itself to no others. It regards man as a moral agent -- a voluntary being. It addresses him as such. This must be self-evident to every man. To *such* the gospel comes with its conditions.

But I must notice again his arguments to prove unconditional salvation. I will present his principal one, and try to meet it. "Acts iii. the apostle testifies to the Jews that in accordance with the promise God sent his Son to bless in '*turning away every one from his iniquities*, i. e. in saving every individual from his sins.'—" "The preceding verse answers the question, Who are to be blessed in Christ? which testimony is, that God covenanted with Abraham, saying, '*And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed*.' Is there any condition expressed or implied here? I can discover none. If there is, will my brother point it out distinctly?" This, I think, presents the strength of his argument; and for the satisfaction of our hearers I will submit the following remarks :

1. Let it be remembered that this scripture, containing the promise, is produced by my opponent in proof of "*future, and eternal salvation*." This he contends is the salvation brought to view in the promise. Bear this in mind.

2. I will now prove to you, *from this very text* and its connection, that the salvation it treats of is *conditional*. Hear the testimony : "for Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things, whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that Prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." How clearly does this bear on its very face conditions of salvation. — (1.) Jesus *was sent* to the

Jews, according to the promise, made to the fathers, that he might turn them from their iniquities. Mark, he *was sent* for this purpose ; but they were not all turned from their iniquities. It does not assert that he *will* turn them in the future state. He "*was sent*" to do it in the days of his flesh, and the fact that he did not do it proves at least a condition implied. (2.) It is *positively asserted* that "*every soul which will not hear*" the Son Jesus, "*shall be destroyed from among the people.*" Thus the salvation spoken of in the text, which my opponent says is future and eternal, is made to depend on the condition of hearing Christ, which implies faith and obedience. I trust I have now "*distinctly pointed out*" the condition, which is not only "*implied,*" but "*expressed.*"

I will introduce once more, Paul's application of the promise in Gal. iii. Still bear in mind that the salvation promised embraces the future and eternal salvation. So says my opponent. "So then they which *be of faith*, are blessed with faithful Abraham. For ye [believers] are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus ; and if ye be Christ's, *then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*"—The same apostle speaks again of the heirship on this wise, Rom. viii. "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. For as many as are led by the spirit of God, *they* are the sons of God. *If children then are heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.*" What can be plainer ? But my opponent tries to evade the force of this reasoning, by saying that all that relates to the condition of salvation refers to the special salvation of believers in this life. But he is a little too late, having applied the very scriptures to future salvation, which we have seen proves salvation to be conditional !

He has undertaken to tell us what the special salvation of believers is. He says, "should any desire to know in what the special salvation of believers consists, this is my reply : In believing the glorious truth that "*God is the Savior of all men,*" they "*enter into rest,*" &c. By this *he* means, that to believe in universalism is the condition of the special blessings promised in this life ! I beg leave to dissent from this. My hear-

ers will pardon me if I speak plainly. It is a fact too well known to be contradicted, that many of the most vicious among us are among the loud proclaimers of this faith. Do they "enter into rest?" Do they "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory?" Yes, according to the theory of my opponent. It requires no *moral* change, only "believe this glorious truth." I will notice this no farther. — I think it must now be conclusive to every candid mind, that if Paul and Peter were capable of understanding the promise made to Abraham, nay, if the Holy Ghost, by whom they wrote, understood it, the salvation of which it treats is conditional. This salvation my opponent says is future and eternal; consequently, future and eternal salvation is conditional. So "saith the scripture."

Before leaving this point I will say one word about the atonement. I observed in my last, that he made the salvation of men depend on the merits of Christ, — this must have been apparent to all. To show his inconsistency, I stated that he did not believe that the death of Christ saves us from a single pang of deserved punishment, or from hell in another world; neither does he save us from the commission of sin in this life. He says, that by so doing I have exhibited my ignorance of his views of the atonement, or else have grossly misrepresented him. I reply, that I am not ignorant of his views, for he frankly avowed them at the time alluded to. Neither have I misrepresented him in the least. Now let him produce his manuscript which he used on that occasion, and convict me of falsehood if he can. If he had given a definite answer to my plain question, and told us in what sense Christ does, or will save us, it would have set the matter right. Why did he not do it? Because, forsooth, "this is not the question under discussion." This appears somewhat strange to me. Through his whole discourse to prove universalism, he made the death of Christ the ground of his faith, which, of course, embraces the doctrine of atonement. Christ "*gave HIMSELF a RANSOM* for all." "*He tasted death* for every man." When I compared his course of reasoning with the well known views of universalists, he happened to discover that the atonement had nothing to do

with this discussion! If this is not *shuffling*, I am unable to determine what is.

II. It will be necessary to say but little at this time in reply to his argument drawn from the will of God, inasmuch as it was proved in my last that the will of God in the sense of his proof text is not done; and further, that his final, and absolute purposes are opposed to the unconditional salvation of all men.

He has avowed his sentiments of *fatalism* a little more fully on this occasion. He quotes my admission that it is the will of God to save all men, and says, "This is all we contend for, — namely, that he that doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, should be acknowledged to be the God who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth." My opponent receives these texts which speaks of God's doing "according to his will," and working "all things after the counsel of his own will," in their broadest and unlimited sense. If they prove anything to his purpose they prove that God's will is done in every particular. Now let us see what kind of a God he has got. God has commanded that man should not murder his fellow man. This is according to his will. But a murder is committed. This too, is according to his will. And then this poor man, who has been doing the will of God, in taking the blood of his neighbor, is condemned for wilful murder and hung. This too is according to the will of God!! In the first place God binds him by his law, "*thou shalt not kill*," then he takes him contrary to this law, and compels him to slay his neighbor, and then, by the same resistless will, he dooms him to the punishment of death! O, wretched man! hast thou fallen into the hands of such a vascillating and cruel tyrant? then hope not for future salvation; for if it be proved to-night that he wills the salvation of all men, to-morrow he may doom all men to endless punishment. If this be so, then all the wars and bloodsheds, all the cruel persecutions of his children, all the outrage that has ever been committed upon the innocent and harmless,

yea, all the sin, wretchedness, and suffering for these 6000 years is according to the will of God! Are you, my hearers, prepared for such a conclusion? And yet you cannot avoid it if you adopt the sentiments of my opponent. The simple meaning of these texts is, that God will execute his purposes in the administration of his government. The subjects of his government are free agents, — and he has purposed that those who are obedient and loyal subjects shall be saved, and those who refuse and rebel shall be damned. With this view, there is harmony in the divine attributes, and consistency in the divine administrations, and in no other light.

We will glance once more at his proof texts, and will take our leave of this argument. God “will have all men to be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth.” Nothing can be plainer than that the text teaches that it is God’s will that all should now be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth now. But this is not the case. This I argued at length in my last, and raised an argument from his proof text against the certainty of God’s will being done. This argument has not been met. All will admit that God wills the salvation of all men from sin in this life. Yes, this same apostle declares that “it is the will of God, even our sanctification,” a state of grace which my opponent thinks *no one* enjoys in this life. Thus it is plain that God’s will is not done in the sense of this text, and how can it prove that all men will be finally holy and happy? This text must be given up.

(Perhaps I ought to notice one thing more. In my remarks on his proof text in Eph. I said that the phrase “all things” could not mean all men, for my opponent remarked that it could not mean those already in Christ. He wonders how I could thus unblushingly accuse him of what his manuscript plainly showed to be false. I ask, did he not say that it could *not* mean those already in Christ? Yes, he admits it now, and his manuscript will show it. How is it then, that I accused him of what is false? Suppose he did remark that it embraced “all intelligent beings,” after saying that it could not refer to those already in Christ, — am I bound to reconcile his inconsistencies and

contradictions. If I were I should have a harder task than he has given me yet.)

He next attempts to reply to *some* of my remarks on his proof text in 1 Cor. xv. chapter. He says "the substance of his [my] argument, is, that only the resurrection of the body is spoken of in this chapter. It assures us that *all* will have a resurrection, but it is not once said that all shall be made holy and happy. But I shall show you that it teaches a contrary doctrine." My opponent asks, "where has he shown this?" I *suppose* he *intended* to prove it by the 23d verse." Thus it seems, that in his estimation, I offered no proof to sustain my position that 1 Cor. xv. was opposed to "the final holiness and happiness of all mankind," but he was left to *conjecture* what I *intended* to do. This is a very convenient way of getting rid of the arguments I presented. But he could not find out where I had shown this, or attempted to show it, notwithstanding he was present when the following arguments were presented from this desk, and had my manuscript which contained them for a week afterwards. Nor is this the first time I have been under the necessity of repeating my arguments before he could see them. Here they are, and our hearers can judge whether they sustain the point or not.

On this text. (1 Cor. xv: 21 — 25,) I submit the following remarks:—

1. The death and resurrection of the *body only* is treated of in this chapter. Not *one word* said in all this "glorious chapter" about "the final holiness and happiness of all mankind." It assures us that *all* will have a resurrection, but it is not once said that all shall be made holy and happy. But I shall show you that it teaches a contrary doctrine.

2. The text teaches that Jesus Christ is to make his second advent at the end of this world — a doctrine entirely fatal to the theory of my opponent. Speaking of the *order* of the resurrection, the apostle says, Christ the first fruits afterward *they that are Christ's* AT HIS COMING." This my opponent says "is plain, literal language." If so the resurrection of the righteous must take place when Christ comes. It is certain that he must make his personal appearance at the time of the

resurrection. This is plainly asserted by the same apostle, in “plain, literal language,” 1 Thess. iv: 16. “*For the LORD HIMSELF shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first.*” Thus his proof text bears on its very face a doctrine which he has positively denied in the course of this discussion; and which destroys his whole theory! Let this be remembered.

3. At the coming of Christ here spoken of, his enemies “*shall be put under his feet.*” This my opponent assumes “is a spiritual and willing subjection to Christ.” This is entirely without evidence. On the contrary, it is plain that this subjection is *not* voluntary; but that it is the subjection of enemies to destroy them. They are to be “*PUT under his feet.*” This does not imply their restitution. An enemy may be subdued without being restored to favor.” The apostle, says Mr. Isaac, “here undoubtedly alludes to the custom of conquerors treading on the necks of their enemies. The captains of Joshua put their feet on the necks of the five kings they had subdued; but it was preparatory to their destruction, not to their restoration. Other scriptures which speak of the transactions to take place at the time of the resurrection fully confirms this view of the subject. We will introduce Matt. xiii. 36 — 43. Let it be remembered that this is not a *parable*, but the *explanation* of a parable.” “And his disciples came unto him, saying, declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one. The enemy that sowed them is the devil, the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, *so shall it be in the end of this world.* The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things which offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear let him hear.” This is Christ’s

explanation of his own parable, and it clearly teaches what the subjection of his enemies will be at the resurrection. Matt. xxv: 31 — 46, teaches the same doctrine, notwithstanding all that my opponent has said to the contrary. In my first article I urged seven objections to his application of it, which are so many arguments in favor of mine, since no one contends for a third application of it. These objections he did not meet. In my last I repeated four of them at greater length, which I consider as unanswerable arguments in favor of a general judgment, when those events will take place mentioned in 1 Cor. xv. Again, Christ plainly teaches, John v. 28, 29, that all will not come forth to spiritual life at the resurrection. The hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." This is "plain, literal language." That God's enemies will be destroyed, and not made holy, at the coming of Christ, is evident from the "plain, literal language of Paul, 2 Thess. i. 7 — 9. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, *taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with EVERLASTING destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.*" I must still urge this as one of my proof texts, for my opponent has not proved his application of it. It confirms the doctrine of his proof text in 1 Cor. that Christ is to come at the resurrection, while it clearly shows what the subjection of his enemies will be. Thus far his arguments turn against his own system with resistless force.

These are the arguments that were put forth to show that his proof text in Cor. not only fails to prove the final holiness and happiness of all mankind, but it teaches the opposite sentiment. You can judge whether they were of sufficient importance to deserve his notice, and if they were why did he not meet them? Is it not plain that he felt unable to answer them, and therefore thought it best to let them pass? So I judge.

One of the passages quoted in the foregoing arguments, he has noticed, namely, John v. 28, 29. "Marvel not at this for

the hour is coming in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation." I shall object to his disposal of it altogether. He asks, "Does this passage have reference to the same resurrection taught in the 15th chapter of 1 Cor.?" and answers "nay," "Does this testimony in John 5th relate to the resurrection of our mortal bodies?" He answers, "no!" What convenient arguments! He applies it to the destruction of Jerusalem, but how it was then fulfilled in that event he does not tell us. The Jews being in their *moral graves* at that time, means, I suppose, that they were in a state of moral death. Now all that were in their moral graves at the time Jerusalem was destroyed, came forth; they that had done good, i. e. the righteous, those that were already alive in Christ, and consequently *had*, already, eternal life, they came forth to the resurrection of life! And they that had done evil, i. e. the wicked, who were already morally dead, came forth to the resurrection of damnation, or condemnation!! Who ever heard of a guilty sinner who is condemned already, having a moral resurrection to condemnation before? I need say no more to notice the absurdity of this application.

My opponent says, "the word *resurrection*, in the passage in John, affords no proof that the allusion is to a rising to an immortal state, — for as Dr. Campbell *justly* observes, this is neither the only, nor the primitive import of the word *anastasis*." For my part, I do not consider myself *sufficiently learned*, as yet, to sit in judgment upon the criticisms of such a learned man as Dr. Campbell, so I am not so well prepared to decide whether the Dr. remarks "*justly*" or *unjustly* concerning the Greek Language. So you see, my learned opponent has the advantage of me in this respect; and it becomes me as a young man, to learn modesty." It would, however, have afforded me much greater satisfaction, had my opponent, instead of giving a garbled quotation from Dr. Campbell, have given his remarks on the definition of *anastasis*, and its application in the scriptures entire; for then our hearers could have judged better of the strength of his argument.

But our business with this word is its meaning as used in the scriptures, and its application by the sacred writers. "*Anastasis*," says President Dwight, "as used in the New-Testament, properly means the future existence of man. Its original and literal meaning is to stand up, or to stand again. It is translated in our English Bible *Resurrection*, which implies both the act of being raised, and the state of the risen." Dr. Dwight was one of the best Greek scholars of his day, and the learned President of Yale College. Dr. Robinson, the Greek Lexicographer, and one of the most distinguished scholars of the present age, says, "*Anastasis*, which means to be risen up, from *anistemi*, to come, to rise up, is used in the scriptures in relation to the resurrection of the body from death. It is spoken 1. of individuals who have returned to life. Heb. ii. 35, women received their dead, *ex anastaseos*, from resurrection, i. e. raised again to life. This same word is used in speaking of the resurrection of Jesus in Acts i. 22; ii. 31; iv. 33; xvii. 18; Rom. i. 4; vi. 5; Phil. iii. 10; 1 Peter i. 3; iii. 21. 2. It is used in speaking of the future and general resurrection at the end of all things. Acts xvii. 42. "And when they heard of the (*anastasin nekron*,) the resurrection of the dead." In Acts xxiv. 15; xxvi. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21, 42, the phrase *anastasis ton nekron*, resurrection of the dead, occurs. The same phrase is in Heb. vi. 2, and is connected with eternal judgment. *Anastaseos te nekron kai krimatos aioniou*. Resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment. In John v. 29, (the text in question) *anastasin* is used in speaking of the resurrection both of the righteous and the wicked. They that have done good, (*eis anastasin zoes*) resurrection unto life, i. e. eternal happiness. And they that have done evil, (*eis anastasin kriseos*,) resurrection unto condemnation, i. e. eternal misery."—So much for his criticism on the word *resurrection*. The same word that is translated resurrection in my proof text, and which my opponent says does not refer to the resurrection of the body, is the same word which occurs in all his proof texts which relate to the resurrection. Now I ask, what evidence is there to support his bold assertion, that the resurrection in John v. is not the same as that in 1 Cor. xv?

not the least. All we have is his bare assertion ; against this I place the united testimony of the scriptures, and the decision of the most distinguished scholars, and will let our hearers decide who is entitled to the argument. He thinks that the same is meant by coming to life in the 29th verse of John v, as is meant in the 25th verse. But a few remarks will settle this question. I will try "to discriminate."

Throughout the New Testament, wherever the literal resurrection of Christ or the bodies of men is spoken of, the word *anastasin* is invariably used. In John v. 24 — 29, both a spiritual and a literal resurrection are spoken of. The first is from a death in sin, in which sinners are destitute of spiritual life, verse 25. In this verse the word *anastasin* is not used. As the transformation is merely from spiritual death to *zoen*, (life,) which word is used here. In verses 28, 29, the Savior says, Marvel not at what I have said unto you, of bringing the dead in sin to life, for the hour is coming in which you shall see a more visible and amazing proof of the power and ability of the Son of man ; for all who are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth. Here we have for the first time in the paragraph, *graves*, and in verse 29, the terms *anastasin zoes*, and *anastasin krieos*, resurrection of life, and resurrection of damnation ; which most clearly show that two different things are referred to in the different sentences in the passage. I trust it is now proved that this text treats of the literal resurrection of the righteous and wicked. The one to eternal life, and the other to eternal damnation, consequently, universalism is proved to be false. Yes, this one text is enough.

The subject of chap. xv. of I Corinthians, is the resurrection of the human body ; and the text so much relied on by my opponent, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," is to be understood of the natural death and resurrection of the body alone. And as we have "borne the image of the earthly, Adam in a frail and corruptible body, so shall we bear the image of the heavenly Adam, Christ Jesus, in his spiritual and incorruptible body. In Luke xx. 34 — 36, our Savior answers the question of the Sadducees,

respecting the right of seven brethren to one woman in the resurrection. He says, "In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; neither can they die any more;" but in both these respects are like the "angels," and are the children of God, not because they are holy, but because they are "the children of the resurrection." There is nothing in this text or context, that favors universalism in the least.

III. He is obliged to pass by my remarks on his promiscuous scriptures, for the want of room, "with but a word of comment." As his "word of comment" deserves no reply, I will pass on. It is sufficient to show that his proof texts contain doctrines which are fatal to his theory. This was shown in my last to be true of Romans v. and he has made no attempt to show to the contrary.

I have now examined all my opponent's principal passages, but do not find universal salvation in one of them; and how any person who reflects seriously, and thinks closely, can satisfy himself that the doctrine is true, on so slight grounds, is not easy to conjecture. Indeed, it has been shown that his very proof texts are against his doctrine. He says, "it was my intention to produce much other testimony in support of the glorious gospel, or glad tidings of a world's redemption, but my limits do not admit." Just look at this. He had no room for further scripture testimony, but has occupied a long space with matter entirely foreign to the discussion. Why has he left the plain testimony of the Bible, when our question confines us to *the scriptures*, and labored to prove his doctrine from the perfections of God, and an appeal to human sympathies? The question is, "Do *the scriptures* teach the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind?" Would he have left the question, if he had been *satisfied* that the scriptures teach his doctrine? I think our hearers must regard this as yielding the point — the scriptures are not sufficient to support his doctrine. He can offer no excuse for this departure, for he himself remarked in his first discourse on the affirmative, "As my time is very brief, and *I am wholly confined to the scriptures*, you will perceive that I am *obliged to omit* the thousand argu-

ments I might derive from reason, from the workings of God's spirit on the renewed heart, and from God's teachings in nature." But he is forced to call in some of his "thousand arguments" after all. He has left the question, has left the Bible, and gone off in a tangent, to find something to support a sinking cause. How true it is, "a drowning man will catch at a straw."

I am under no obligation to reply to his arguments drawn from the perfections of God, and the feelings of earthly parents, as they have nothing to do with the question we agreed to discuss. But for the sake of showing that his cause can find no support from these new sources, I will give them a passing notice.

1. I shall take ground that the attributes of God, aside from revelation and matter of fact, do not furnish sufficient data from whence to deduce conclusions concerning man's future destiny. In support of this position, I offer the following considerations.

"(1.) God cannot make a full revelation of himself to us, in view of our want of capacity to comprehend infinity. The attributes of God can be fully known only to himself; hence any conclusions drawn from the divine perfections, are deductions drawn from premises we do not understand, and our conclusions must be as uncertain as our knowledge of the premises is imperfect. We do not say that we do not know what some of the divine perfections are; God has revealed to us that he is almighty, wise, just, holy and good; but we cannot so understand these perfections as to be able to determine from them, aside from scripture and matter of fact, what is, and what is not consistent with them. We can determine what is, and what is not, consistent with the attributes of God, only by what we see actually exist, or from what God has said in the scriptures. If my opponent will prove from the Bible that all men will be saved, we shall be bound to admit that it is consistent with the divine perfections, to save, in a future world, those who only abuse his mercies in this, and die in unbelief and contempt of his authority; and if I can prove from the scrip-

tures, as I trust I have, that some men will be endlessly miserable, he will be bound to admit that endless punishment is consistent with the divine attributes, though he may not be able to see any reason in the divine attributes why it should be so. That we cannot discover what is, and what is not, consistent with the divine perfections is clear, from the simple fact, that providence has already developed many things for which we can see no reason in the divine perfections. I presume my opponent can see no reason in the divine goodness, why a holy, devoted and useful minister should be put to the rack, and caused to suffer a most painful death *by the hand of an ungodly sinner*; and I can see no reason in the divine justice why God should *take the murdered and the murderer to the same heaven*.

“(2.) The perfections of God do not enable us to determine what the desert of sin is; a point that must be settled before it can appear that endless punishment is not consistent with the divine justice and goodness. Can my opponent, from any knowledge he has of the divine perfections, clearly determine the extent of the evils of sin, and what and how much punishment the sinner is liable to endure? If he can, he will confer a favor on the world to speak out, and say just what and how much the sinner must endure, to answer the claims of the divine law; and if he cannot determine from the divine perfections, what and how much the sinner deserves, he cannot know but that a punishment worse, and much longer than he has imagined, may be consistent with the perfections of God. We believe these points must be settled by the law and the testimony of God’s word, and not by some rule of consistency, in our own imaginations, by which we would direct the attributes of God in the government of the world.

“(3.) The perfections of God in our opinion, do not of themselves, so far as we are enabled to understand them, prove the immortality of the soul or the resurrection of the body. What is there discoverable in the perfections of God, that proves that the spirit of man, that goeth upward, is any more immortal than the spirit of the beast that goeth downward? or that our bodies will be raised any more than theirs? And if a future

state is not clearly discoverable in the perfections of God, they cannot, independently of direct revelation, prove the final salvation of all men.

“(4.) If the future destiny of man can be determined from the perfections of God, no good reason can be given why every other point in theology cannot be proved in the same way. Now, will my opponent contend that he can discover what is truth, and what is error, from his knowledge of the divine perfections? If he can, then all those portions of the scriptures, which do not relate to the attributes of God, are not necessary in order to a correct theory of religion; and if he cannot determine from the attributes of God, what is, and what is not religious truth, it cannot appear that he can prove from this source, what will be the punishment of sin, or the sinner’s final destiny. It must be perfectly plain; that if we have a view of the perfections of God sufficiently clear, to enable us to determine what is, and what is not, consistent with them, we can need no further revelation than that which relates directly to God and his other attributes; for whatever is consistent with the divine attributes must be true, and does or may exist; and whatever is not consistent with the divine attributes, does not, and cannot exist.

“(5.) So far as any thing can be proved, from the perfections of God, on this subject, the argument is in our favor. Though we cannot discern what is consistent with the perfections of God, from any view we have of his perfections; yet we can determine that some things are consistent with them, from the actual existence of the things themselves. We know that whatever does exist must be consistent with the divine perfections; hence, when we behold the existence of any thing and infer from thence that such thing is consistent with the perfections of God, we reason from matter of fact, and not from the divine perfections. We cannot prove from the perfections of God that the existence of sin and misery are consistent with such perfections, yet this point can be proved from matter of fact; for sin and misery do exist, and therefore, we know, from their actual existence, that their existence is consistent with the perfections of God. This throws the weight of the argu-

ment into our side of the scales, for matter of fact says it is consistent with the divine perfections that sin and misery should exist, while matter of fact cannot be brought to bear on the other side of the question. Matter of fact cannot prove that it is consistent with the divine perfections to save all men, whatever may be their conduct, for all men are not saved. Not only so, but it is now consistent with the divine perfections that sin and misery should exist, and as these attributes are unchangeable, the inference is a fair one that it may always be consistent with the divine perfections that sin and misery should exist. I think I have now removed the entire foundation of every argument drawn from the perfections of God, in favor of universalism; hence, the arguments must fall.”*

I will here notice one or two inquiries, to which my attention is particularly called. He says, “my brother has acknowledged that it is God’s will that all men should be saved. If then, God would save all mankind, but *cannot*, is he infinite in power? If God can save all mankind, but *will not*, is he infinite in goodness? I will thank my brother to carefully examine these questions—drawn from the acknowledged character of God, as revealed in the scriptures, in his rejoinder. They are affirmative arguments with me.”

I reply, that it is acknowledged that God is infinite in goodness and benevolence; consequently, he must desire the happiness of all his creatures at all times. But this world has been full of sin and misery for 6000 years. Now to show the fallacy of my opponent’s reasoning, I will adopt it in this case. If then, God would make all mankind holy and happy in this state of existence, but *cannot*, is he infinite in power? If God *can* make all mankind holy and happy now, but *will not*, is he infinite in goodness?”—Thus it is seen how easily all his questions which relate to the power and goodness of God, might be turned round, and demand an answer of him which he *cannot* give without destroying his own arguments. Into what labyrinths of inconsistency and absurdity is a man thrown, when he denies the free agency of men, and the conditionality of salvation! Admit these and there is no difficulty in harmo-

* Luther Lee.

nizing the divine attributes with God's dealings with men, and the doctrines of the Bible. And what *folly*, not to say *blasphemy*, for poor, finite man to sit in judgment on the government of Almighty God, and undertake to tell what would, and what would not be consistent for God to do! O, Presumption! where is thy shame? Teach *me*, thou Sovereign of the universe, to sit at the foot of the cross, with a submissive spirit, willing that *thou* shouldst reign!

2. My opponent has made an appeal to human sympathies, to prove that all mankind will be finally holy and happy. He wants to know what would be thought of a parent who would do so and so with a child. I ask what would you think of a parent who would drown his children, as God drowned the antediluvians? or who should burn them as God did the inhabitants of Sodom?

The conduct and feelings of earthly parents are no rule for the administration of the divine government. God will not be governed by sympathy, but by his own eternal and immutable justice.

Thus much for his new arguments. I think this brief notice is sufficient to show that they *prove* nothing to his purpose.

I have now done with the arguments of my opponent. Our candid hearers are left to decide in reference to the arguments which have been offered on both sides of the question. It has been my object in the course of this discussion, to *present, and defend truth*. God is my judge, to him I must give an account. The feelings I have indulged, the spirit I have manifested, the course I have pursued, is all open before him with whom I have to do. The result of the discussion on my own mind has been to increase my confidence in the doctrine I have advocated. I *fully* believe it to be the doctrine of the Bible, and unless I seek a refuge in the merits of Jesus Christ by a living faith, I shall expect to share, and that *justly* too, the torments of the damned.

I respectfully request our hearers to call to mind the arguments which have been presented on both sides, and see if they can be satisfied beyond a doubt, that the arguments in favor of endless punishment have been fully met and satisfactorily answered. Also, if the position that all mankind will be finally

holy and happy, has been fully sustained by plain scripture testimony. Are you *fully satisfied* that eternal salvation is *not* conditional? If so, how do you reconcile it with Heb. v. 9. Jesus Christ “became the author of *ETERNAL salvation to all them that OBEY him?*” Are you *fully satisfied* that God has *absolutely purposed* to make all men finally holy and happy? If so, where is it recorded? Has my opponent produced any such passage? Are you *fully satisfied* that at the resurrection all will come forth to spiritual life? Are you not rather satisfied that I have proved to the contrary this evening? The arguments are before you, and you can decide. May the Spirit of truth lead you to a right decision! If you are not *perfectly* sure that all will be saved, let their moral character here be what it will, let me invite you to Christ, where you may find rest to your souls. I ask you not to believe in my peculiar sentiments as the condition of salvation,—but “*believe on the Lord Jesus Christ with all thy heart, and thou shall be saved.*” So THE SPIRIT TESTIFIETH. AMEN.

ERRATA. As I had not the opportunity of seeing all the proof sheets of my discourses, several slight errors in punctuation, quotation marks, &c. have escaped without correction.

On page 104, 18 lines from the bottom, read, “so his will may be done, or it may not be done.” F. YATES.

825



Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2006

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 016 162 061 0

